NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. Without Concealment—Without Compromise. JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, Corresponding Editor.

VOLUME IX.---NO. 43. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 1849. WHOLE NUMBER 459.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY
At 142 Nassau Street, New-York.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to the Editor

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. Gay, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

Terms.—Two dollars per annum: Strictly in advance in all cases.

Selections.

THE SOUTHERN PRESS.

We confine our extracts, this week, to such Southern papers—by far the larger number—as are characterised by the moderation of their tone on the present position of affairs, and are clearly not disposed to accept the alternative of Disunion to secure the extension of Slavery:

From the New-Orleans Commercial Times.

Mr. Calhoun's Address.—It is generally understood that the address, recently made by the Southern delegates in Congress, to their constituents, emanated from the pen of Mr. Calhoun, although the original draught was materially modified, before it was signed by the forty-five members, whose names are now appended to it. Of course it is of such a character as to attract the attention of the whole Southern people. It remains to be seen, whether this appeal will provoke any action on the part of the South; or, whether it will be treated with an indifference which would be tantamount to the severest condemnation.

The address, as it seems to us, with all due deference, begins in error, for it is directed to the Southern people, and not to the people of the Union. If any portion of the American people should have been addressed, it was the party in the wrong; the attempt ought to have been made to persuade them to do what is deemed to be right. Hence, it is the Northern people who should have been addressed. It is only when force is to be applied, in order that a grievance may be removed, that an injured party is appealed to. But the address proposes no such conduct. It submits no plan of action; it only entreats to a union that already exists. The Southern people are, to a man, determined to resist any and every encroachment which may be made on their rights; but we doubt if they make any response to the appeal which has just been made to them, by some of their representatives in Congress, individually. The South feels that its position on the subject of Slavery, must be altogether and essentially conservative. Inflammatory words and violent action are derogatory to Southern interests; for they tend to agitate, when we should aim at remaining quiet. We are on the defensive. The shout of attack and the fury of onset is not for us We seek to maintain vested rights, to secure property in possession. Hence the "masterly inactivity" which some have, at times, found it convenient to advocate on other questions, is our wisest course and most effective defense. The Southern people must feel this; and therefore, we think, the Address which has just been issued will fail in producing any marked effect, of an active character. For there must be an object in this document, though it is not avowed; there is much that is inflammatory in its words, though shrouded in a studied phraseology. Throughout the whole paper there reigns an air of perfect quiet and candor; but its deep and concealed passion is all the more dangerous, because it assumes the calm guise of truth and reason. Let us examine some of its expositions in detail.

In accordance with the spirit which actuated the prime mover—it is impossible to conceal the fact, that Mr. Calhoun is, in this, as in many other cases, the maker of the "crisis" he so lamentably bemoans—in sending this address to the people of the South, instead of to the people of the United States. All old quarrels are raked up, and all the dissensions of the Missouri question are dwelt on with a minuteness which marks a studious desire to rip up old grievances and unsettle the compromises of the past. In tones of fear and apprehension, which have become habitual to the great South Carolina Senator, the year 1849 is spoken of as a year "destined to mark a train of events, bringing with them many, and great, and fatal disasters on the country and its institutions." Why thus refer to the struggles and discussions of the past? Why embitter the contests of the present, by looking backwards? Such is not the course of compromise. Compromise forgets and forgives; it looks altogether on the future, and cares little or nothing for the past. It seeks not to unsettle, but to confirm and consolidate. We have all been accustomed to consider the Missouri compromise as a wise and salutary adjustment, happily agreeing with the spirit of the Constitution, if not exactly in accordance with this letter. Yet here, in the Southern Address, is an insinuation that this measure was not really a compromise, but a concession on the part of the South. The attempt is made to stir up the angry passions of the Southern people, by dwelling at length on the fancied indignities they are represented as having suffered at the hands of the North.

The address next approaches the question in regard to the new territories of California and New Mexico. And here Mr. Calhoun surprises us, with one of those sudden evolutions so characteristic of his political career, and which military men would call retreating from a position. During the last session of Congress, Mr. Calhoun argued that the United States were bound to secure slaveholders in the possession of their property, when emigrating to any of our territories, even although the territory might have been previously free. If we mistake not, such was the position he attempted to maintain in the long speech, which opened with the transcendently trivial criticism on the preamble of the Declaration of Independence. Now, however, it is asserted as his faith, that the "Federal Government has no right to extend or restrict Slavery. But if the general Government secures to slaveholders, who emigrate into free territory, the possession of their slaves does it not assume the right to extend Slavery?—The position which the address maintains is, as we think, the only reasonable and safe ground for the South. We only wish that those who signed the address would act up to their professions. But how have Mr. Calhoun and his particular friends acted throughout the whole of this difficulty, in regard to legislation for the new territories? Have they ever looked with favour on any measure of compromise? Did they advocate the passage of Mr. Clayton's bill or did they abet those who wished to extend the line of the Missouri Compromise to the Pacific Ocean? Did they vote for the Oregon bill, which recognized both the principle of the Missouri compromise, and the principle that the people of the territories have the right to legislate for themselves on the matter of Slavery, or have they vituperated and misrepresented Southern men who voted for this measure? Do they now support the bill of Mr. Douglass, for introducing California as a State, or are they the principal agents in opposing this bill, representing it as both unconstitutional and inexpedient? It is not for men who have pursued the course of Mr. Calhoun and his peculiar supporters, to come forward and complain that they have been badly treated. They have never manifested any disposition to conciliate; they have uniformly abjured compromise.

The address passes to a review of the acts of the House of Representatives, during the present session. True, there has been much rash conduct on the part of the Lower House, during the last few weeks; but who, let us ask, have been the chief instigators in bringing about the state of feeling at present existing among many members of Congress from the North? We unhesitatingly affirm, that the violent Pro-Slavery men have, unwittingly, no doubt concurred with the violent Abolitionists, in producing the present agitation of the Slavery question. Mr. Calhoun is fond of general propositions, and has, in his usual style, given us several, in his last address, on the nature and dispositions of fanaticism. Unfortunately, he has overlooked one of the leading characteristics of fanaticism—its tendency to increase from violent and unreasonable opposition. The history of all fanatcism teaches us, but too plainly, that those have been its most efficient fosterers, who laboured over zealously to destroy its power and influence. To deal with Northern Abolitionism, requires the utmost coolnes and discretion; we are afraid that Mr. Calhoun and his followers not only lack the requisite tact, but also the conciliatory disposition necessary for the management of abolitionist zealots, nearly approaching, if not already entering the bounds of insanity.

But, when the address has exhausted the past, it turns to the future, and pours out prophecies on the probable results of negro-emancipation in the Southern States. It does not dismiss so disagreeable a subject, with a sentence or a short paragraph. It seems to delight in holding up before the eyes of the Southern people, all those pictures of woe and desolation, which a disordered imagination creates in its moments of melancholy and despair. It gloats over the miseries of Jamaica, and tortures us with jeremiades on our own future prospects and condition.—Such prophecies as these we regard as vagaries of the heart, no less than of the head. They stir up bad passions; they kindle the demon that lurks within the breast of humanity. As errors of the head, they are only worthy of ridicule. They are trifling; unworthy of grave Senators and Legislators; and are the products of a vain and shallow political philosophy, that fancies itself profound. because it affects the rigid forms of a scholastic logic. As errors of the heart, they are deserving of the severest reprobation. Such forebodings are not often uttered by the good men of the race; if felt, they are concealed, for their mere utterance may help to work out their fulfilment. They are spoken of, and dwelt on, by the evil prophets only—those whose passions are supreme and whose higher sentiments are obscured. For ourselves, we have no fears of the future—at least no such fears as those expressed in the Southern address. And as for the sentiments of the Southern people, we believe there is not a man among us who does not reecho in the depths of his soul, the immortal words, "liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

From the New Orleans Daily Crescent.

The Southern Address.—We publish this morning the address of the "Southern Members of Congress to their Constituents," drawn up by Mr. Calhoun and adopted by a majority of the delegates.—Our readers are aware that we have from the beginning doubted the wisdom of holding the Convention, and expressed our fears that its labours would be productive of no real benefit, but might lead to positive evil. This apprehension has been justified by the result. The Convention has shown the want of unity in feeling—of harmony in action among the leading men of the South, upon a question which, if it be of any importance at all, is of the deepest. It cannot be hoped that the opinions or the interests of the South should be respected by those who honestly believe that Slavery is an evil and ought by any means to be abolished, nor yet by those who make use of this abolition agitation to subserve purposes of personal ambition or party ascendancy, if in the very crisis of our fate, the hour of imminent danger and severest trial, there is no accord among ourselves. The crisis, it is asserted, is now come. Yet the Southern representatives—men who have been selected from among the whole people as best qualified to defend, and most worthy to be entrusted with the defence of their rights and interests—have made the discovery that they cannot even unite upon so simple a matter as an address upon the questions at issue. When the telegraphic reports reached us that Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Berrien had each made a report; that the one of Mr. Calhoun had been adopted, and those who favoured the report of Mr. Berrien would not sign the other, we had supposed that there was some marked difference between the two, and that the one adopted contained matter of dangerous, if not of treasonable import, which would justify a refusal to sanction it on the part of patriotic Southern men. We confess, however, that we can see no great difference in the facts or the reasonings of the two; and nothing so very alarming in the one finally sanctioned by a majority of the Convention. The paper itself is a very unpretending statement of facts, showing the manner in which the plain provisions of the Constitution have been directly and indirectly set at nought by the action or refusal to act of the Northern States; the injustice done to the citizens of the South by the attempt to extend the provisions of the ordinance of 1787, over all new territory; the assault upon the institution of Slavery in the States, concealed or avowed, by the movements now being made in relation to its existence in the District of Columbia; and the danger to the rights, property, and even lives of our citizens, from the forced emancipation which will inevitably follow the continuance of this system of inimical measures. There is nothing in the address which is not true—and the truth is expressed in a manner neither harsh nor offensive. After the detail of grievances, it recommends nothing but a spirit of unity among the Southern people—a unity not found among the representatives themselves—with the hope that by presenting an undivided front, the North may be induced to pause in its career, and desist from its violence and aggression. In this there may be something ludicrous, coming from a divided representation. but there is nothing, most assuredly, dangerous. The recommendation is a very simple and an innocent one—one which could produce no evil if carried out, but one which we imagine will make little more impression upon the constituency than it did upon their representatives.

There has been, and there is, no union of sentiment among the politicians of the South. They have played with this question of Slavery for party purposes, until they have endangered the whole system. The people are united in feeling, but they are separated by party names, and kept asunder by party leaders, and they will, we fear, never be brought into united and harmonious action until such action shall have become useless. We say these things with regret, but they are truths which may as well be told—truths demonstrated by all past history, and by nothing more clearly than by the action of this Southern Convention itself, and by the manner in which its proceedings are viewed by this or that party, by the friends of this or that prominent leader. Lovers of the Constitution and the Union, our earnest prayer is that both may be perpetual—that our people may observe the one and preserve the other through all coming time. But the Union was created by the Constitution, depends upon it for its vitality, and must cease to be when the bond that connects it has been broken. The way to save the Union is to guard the Constitution from infraction, to preserve every article and clause of it inviolable. A united, firm and peaceful stand taken by *the people* of the Southern States, would secure this inviolability. The great body of the Northern people, friends of the Constitution and Union, would side with us in such a course—the fanatics, contemptible in numbers and weak by cause of their own rashness, would assail us in vain—and politicians who make a trade of agitation, would cease from an unprofitable employment. But divided as we are and have been, the work of aggression will go on till our grievences are too enormous for endurance, and our numbers have become too few for peaceful, and our power too small for forcible, resistance.

From the [Macon, Georgia,] Journal and Messenger.

The Southern Address.—The address of Mr. Calhoun to the Southern people will be found in our columns to-day. That of Mr. Berrien will be given next week, together with the Journal of the Convention and the yeas and nays on the several propositions before the body. The latter address was adopted by the sub-committee but rejected by a few votes in the general committee.

There are 121 Southern Senators and Representatives in Congress—75 Democrats, and 46 Whigs.—Of these, 45 have signed Mr. Calhoun's address—being only a little more than one third of the whole number. The movement therefore has lost its moral force and must be regarded as a failure to unite the South. The whole question will probably pass over to General Taylor's administration and we feel confident that it will be by him adjusted so as to guard the rights of the South and perpetuate the Union.

From the Columbus [Ga.] Enquirer.

Mr. Calhoun's Address.—We publish to-day, as a portion of the passing history of the times, the Address of the Hon. John C. Calhoun and others, to their constituents. This doctrine emanates, as our readers know, from what has been termed a Convention of Southern members of Congress, who have undertaken to embody the public sentiment of the South on the subject of Slavery, and prepare the public mind for the crisis which seems rapidly approaching. How far success has attended or will attend their efforts we are not able to say, or to anticipate.

It is known that we were, from the first, inclined to the opinion that but little good would result from this self-constituted assembly; but still we are willing to await its action, and see if any plan could be devised whereby the exciting subject of its deliberations might be put to rest, the rights of the South secured, and the integrity of the Union preserved. In the progress of its proceedings, we become more and more inclined to the belief that nothing would be done worthy the men engaged in directing the matter, and that the South would be weakened if not ultimately divided not only as to the extent of her wrongs, but as to the mode and measure of her redress. The address before us goes far to confirm us in these reasonable anticipations. In looking over it we find nothing new or striking, nothing but a dull, insipid, and tasteless rehash of what has been said and urged for twenty years past, without a solitary suggestion as to what the South shall do in any conceivable emergency. We are told of our wrongs, but pointed to no remedy.

There is, to be sure, a request that the people shall be *united*. This request is well enough at times, but why thus solemnly make it at this time, on such a subject. Are the people of the South divided in opinion as to their constitutional rights on the subject of Slavery? Are there any that will not defend these rights at a proper time and in a proper way? Are there any less friendly to our peculiar institutions than Mr. Calhoun and his especial followers? If so, who are they? He and they may rant as they always have done on somewhat similar occasions, but they may rest assured that the great body of the Southern people will meet this matter so full of peril to the Union, in a becoming spirit.—They may not unite with the rampant demagogues that would use this fearful question as a stepping-stone to momentary popular favour, but they will unite with the patriots throughout the broad Union in giving it such a direction as may if possible secure their rights and preserve this glorious Confederacy.

It will be seen that only about one-third of the Southern members have signed this address. Another, very similar in its tendency and details, was prepared by Senator Berrien, and will probably receive the signatures of another portion of the Convention.

The whole matter so far as it has gone, is but little better than child's play. Our representatives were expected and are still expected, to meet and repel every aggression that may be made upon our rights not in irresponsible conclaves, but as the recognized and constitutional agents of the people.—Let them then stand firm at their posts, battle against every encroachment come from where it may, stand firm amid the fury of the storm that howls around them, and, planting themselves on the Constitution of their country, perish, if need be, on that firm foundation. Their constituents will look to the rest. The people in the majesty of their undelegated power will, at the proper time, assert their rights. The Legislatures will designate the mode and measure of redress. When this perilous hour comes there will be no occasion for our representatives to appeal to their constituents to be united. Self-preservation will demand a unity of action, and public sentiment will secure it.

From the Louisville [Ky.] Journal.

Mr. Berrien's Address.—Instead of publishing only a part, we have determined to publish the whole of this address. We wish to show that, as far as facts and arguments are concerned, Mr. Berrien's report agrees entirely with that of Mr. Calhoun. Mr. Berrien appeals to the patriotism of the people of the United States, and, like a loyal adherent to the country and Constitution, he goes no further, but he sets forth the same grievances which Mr. Calhoun sets forth. Although many Southern Congressmen very wisely refused to sign Mr. Calhoun's address, and though some of them thought it inexpedient to make any address at all, we believe that Mr. Berrien's address would be subscribed to by ninety-nine out of every hundred of the people of the Slave States. Let, therefore, the people of the North take the address of Mr. Berrien as speaking the universal opinion of the South, and let them reflect candidly and dispassionately on the grounds of that opinion. Has not the North virtually nullified the clause in the Constitution providing for the restoration of runaway slaves? And was it not the duty of the Northern States and all their citizens to enforce in good faith this as all other provisions of the Constitution? And has not the North constantly for years disturbed the tranquility of the Union by interfering with Slavery in the South? And what can the North gain but mischief by prohibiting Slavery in California, if, as they contend, that territory from geographical necessity must be free? We trust that the two Southern addresses will be deeply pondered by the people of the North, and that they who have so causelessly disturbed the harmony of the Union will feel it to be their duty to act hereafter in a very different spirit toward their Southern brethren. Harmony, opinion, and interests are the bonds of this Union, and it cannot remain a day after the two sections have become irreconcileably hostile toeach other.

From the New Orleans Courier.

The Crisis.—The most interesting subject of discussion, now before the American people, is undoubtedly the proceedings of the Southern States upon the abolition question. All the topics of news or debate are mere *fibble-jabble* compared to this. If the South act with wisdom and firmness at the commencement of the difficulty, the Constitution will be saved and the South will be secure. A false step; a sign of faltering, of weakness or timidity on the part of the Southern people will hasten the crisis by inducing their enemies to protect themselves. We never had any faith in the proceedings of the Southern members of Congress, acting as a seceded and separate body, without authority or precise information from their constituents. As they took it upon themselves to act, it was desirable that their proceedings should be harmonious. It was plain from the beginning that this would not be the case—because some of those soi-disant Southern members are open advocates of the Wilmot Proviso, against which it was the business of the meeting to protest, as it is the determination of the South to resist it. Others of the members were suspected of entertaining motives of action of a selfish character, distinct from wishes to promote the welfare and quiet of the country—others again, were known to be more desirous of raising the Whig party into the ascendant than of maintaining and securing the rights and interests of the Southern States. It could not be expected that the deliberations of an assembly thus composed would produce a result advantageous or honourable to the South.

We have not seen the Address which was agreed upon by a thin majority of a meeting thinly attended; neither that nor the substitute offered by Mr. Berrien has come to hand. They are said to differ materially in their tone and spirit. It is impossible to judge of the temper which pervaded either the majority or minority. Both of them may be, and we presume both of them are justly liable to objections—otherwise they would not respectively have encountered so strong an opposition.

Meanwhile, we are happy to observe that the little State of Florida has come up to the scratch, resolved to raise her voice in favour of the Constitution. It becomes Florida more than any other State in the confederacy to take this position and to maintain it—simply because she can maintain no other. One of the resolutions adopted by the Legislature reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia, involving, as it does, an exercise of power not granted by the Constitution, and designed as it is as a means of effecting the institution of Slavery in the States, against which it is aimed as a blow, should be resisted on the part of the South, by whatever means the best adapted to the protection of the Constitution, the defence of herself, and the preservation of the Union.

This strong denunciation of the measures proposed by the enemies of the South for the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia is very good, excellent, pleasant to read, and we trust will have all the salutary effects that can be desired, both at Washington and throughout the South—and it is to be hoped that the President of the United States Senate, that "eminent statesman, of sound conservative principles," forgetting all past incidents and records, may regard that proposed measure as the members of the Florida legislature seem to regard it; and this they have a right to expect from him, as a large majority of their constituents voted to place him in the high station which he is to assume on the 4th day of next month. We hope all will go well—we hope the predictions of Corwin, and all the true friends of General Taylor in the Northern States, that he will sanction the Wilmot Proviso, will be falsified. The Wilmot Proviso is denounced by the Florida legislature in language nearly as strong as that which they apply to the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia, and we do trust the discussion of this question will terminate favourably, either through the interposition of the casting vote of Mr. Fillmore or the veto of General Taylor.

After all, we entertain no apprehensions for the result, let the members of Congress, the President and Vice President, do as they please. The secession of the Southern members has been unfortunate in its consequences. But the people of the South, represented in their legislatures, are unanimous in their determination to uphold the Constitution and defend their own best interests. Thus united and thus resolved, they bid defiance to all attempts of fraud and force to injure or oppress them.

From the same.

The Southern Members.—In the Richmond Enquirer there is a letter from Washington, dated January 24, giving an interesting account of the proceedings of the Southern members on the 22d. Mr. Berrien of Georgia exhibited an unexpected degree of vigour and good sense in replying to Mr. Stephens of the same State, who had protested against active proceedings. The letter says Mr. Berrien spoke at length with great feeling and eloquence. He declared the time had come for action of the proper sort. The preparations for aggression have surely advanced more rapidly this session than heretofore. The moment before collision is always more favorable to conciliation than the moment after. He should move on in the course dictated as proper by his own conscience, and though he regretted to separate from those with whom he usually acted, he should, on this question, know no party. He was opposed to sectional appeals.

We are the more satisfied with Mr. Berrien's course in this affair, as being a very cautious, peaceful, calculating sort of person, he probably acts in accordance with what he supposes to be the sentiments of the State of Georgia, which he represents in the Senate.

"The Union must and will be preserved!" This was the maxim of Old Hickory and it is the maxim of every true American. The Union will be preserved, and the treason of abolition frightened out of existence.

From the Baltimore American.

Mr. Calhoun's Address is reviewed by the *New Orleans Times* with great frankness and with equal power of discrimination. It is declared to begin with an error and to terminate in nothing—starting with an appeal to a section of the country, instead of the whole country, and ending with an entreaty to a union which already exists. The South has never been otherwise than united on the point of a defence of its rights.

But the ground is taken by the *Times*, and very justly, that an aggressive attitude does not belong to the South—does not become her. Her position is that of defence, a conservative position. She stands upon recognized rights, upon constitutional guarantees; and her assailants must attack these, and prostrate them, before they can reach her.

"It is impossible to conceal the fact," says the *Times*, "that Mr. Calhoun is, in this, as in many other cases, the maker of the crisis he so lamentably bemoans." The raking up of old quarrels, the recapitulation of past dissensions, the minute specification of matters of offence, from the time of the Missouri controversy to the present—these indicate anything but a patriotic desire to avert strife, being calculated rather to stir up the angry passions both of the North and of the South—the one by accusatory denunciations, and the other by the aggravated enumeration of alleged indignities.

With regard to any mode proposed for an amicable settlement of the Slavery question, in connection with the territories, it is declared that Mr. Calhoun and his particular friends have always been found adverse to an adjustment. Mr. Clayton's bill of the last session, the Oregon bill, recognizing the principle of the Missouri Compromise, the bill of Mr. Douglas, now before the Senate, have all met with opposition from that quarter. The *Times* affirms that it is not for men who have pursued the course of Mr. Calhoun and his peculiar supporters, to come forward and complain that they have been badly treated—they, who have never manifested any disposition to conciliate; they, who have uniformly abjured compromise.

The course of Mr. Calhoun is characterized as quite as deficient in fact as it is in a rational spirit of patriotic fraternity. He is, in fact, charged with being unwittingly a coöperator with the violent Abolitionists, in producing the very agitation in which the latter have their very principles of existence. Without a further recapitulation, however, of this article of the *Times*, we quote its conclusion:

But, when the address has exhausted the past, it turns to the future, and pours out prophecies on the probable results of negro emancipation in the Southern States.—It does not dismiss so disagreeable a subject with a sentence or a short paragraph. It seems to delight in holding up before the eyes of the Southern people, all those pictures of woe and desolation, which a disordered imagination creates in its moments of melancholy and despair. It gloats over the miseries of Jamaica, and tortures us with jeremiades on our own future prospects and condition. Such prophecies as these we regard as vagaries of the heart, no less than of the head. They stir up bad passions; they kindle the demon that lurks within the breast of humanity. As errors of the head, they are only worthy of ridicule. They are trifling; unworthy of grave Senators and Legislators; and are the products of a vain and shallow political philosophy, that fancies itself profound, because it affects the rigid forms of a scholastic logic. As errors of the heart, they are deserving of the severest reprobation. Such forebodings are not often uttered by the good men of the race; if felt, they are concealed, for their mere utterance may help to work out their fulfilment. They are spoken of, and dwelt on, by the evil prophets only—those whose passions are supreme and whose higher sentiments are obscured. For ourselves, we have no fears of the future—at least no such fears as those expressed in the Southern address. And as for the sentiments of the Southern people, we believe there is not a man among us who does not reecho in the depths of his soul, the immortal words, "liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

This is a severe criticism. But it belongs to that class of criticisms which regard individuals strictly as official personages, and in connection with their own expositions of themselves. It comes, moreover, from a source which cannot be chargeable with sectional prejudices of an adverse kind—nor with political antipathies, the paper from which we quote being neutral. The good sense of the Southern people, we doubt not, is fully as much opposed to ultraism on this subject, and as little inclined to aid Mr. Calhoun in his efforts to produce excitement concerning it, as the calm reason and judgment of every other portion of the Union.

From the Observer and Reporter.

Mr. Calhoun's Address.—This document, which, our readers are aware, was adopted by the Convention of Southern members held at the Capitol at Washington a few days ago, is given in full in our paper this morning. It will, of course, command the undivided attention of all, not only from its intrinsic ability, but because of the importance of the subject to which it has reference. We do not altogether admire the spirit of this address, not certain of the wise end to which it evidently looks as a remedy for the evils complained of, although no one who reads it can for a moment fail to accord to it the merit of having presented the grievances of which the South complains in a most plausible, imposing and temperate manner. In this respect, we should have preferred the address of Mr. Berrien as that upon which the South should stand, for while it adopts almost verbatim most of the address of Mr. Calhoun, to which every man living in a Slave State can subscribe, it at the same time is divested of much that is exceptionable on the score of its being sectional in its character, and of its seeming to look to a dissolution of the Union as the end of all this business. While Mr. Calhoun addresses himself particularly to the South, Mr. Berrien appeals to the people of the whole Union, as in our judgment was very properly the case.

We trust this whole matter may result in good to the country—that it will show to all, the South as well as the North, that forbearance is to be desired, and that the constitutional rights of every section of the Union should be respected. We have no fears for the Union. There is enough of conservatism widely diffused throughout the whole country to check the wild and visionary schemes of fanaticism run mad, and which would not stop to calculate the consequences of its rashness and impetuosity. From the new Administration, now about to come into power, much is to be expected in allaying the angry feelings which have manifested themselves, and if all these difficult and apparently dangerous questions growing out of our acquisitions of foreign territory particularly, are not wisely adjusted, so as to preserve the harmony and integrity of the Union, we shall confess that we have been grossly deceived in our estimate of that administration, and its patriotic head.

DEFERRED DEBATE IN THE SENATE.

Wednesday, February 28, 1849.

The Civil and Diplomatic Appropriation Bill having been reported to the Senate by the Committee on the Whole, and the question being on concurring in the amendment of Mr. Walker in relation to the Territories acquired from Mexico—

Mr. Dix said: I regret to be under the necessity of asking the indulgence of the Senate at this late period of the session; but I feel it my duty to make some remarks upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Walkerr) and the general subject to which it relates. I regret also to be under the necessity of discussing the question providing a government for California, in the form under which it is presented to us—in an amendment to an appropriation bill. Independently of this objection, I have considered it from the beginning a measure of too great importance to be disposed of in this incidental manner. The proposition of the Senator from Tennessee, (Mr. Bell,) also in the form of an amendment to this bill, was ruled out of this body, upon the ground that it was incongruous and out of place. It received in the end but four votes. I consider this amendment equally irrevelent and misplaced.

The amendment of the Senator from Tennessee proposed to admit California and New Mexico into the Union as a State. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin arms the President with extraordinary powers to govern these territories, on the score of congruity, in respect to the general purposes of the bill upon which they were proposed to be engrafted, I see no difference between them; and I do not understand how one proposition should be resisted on the ground that it is incongruous, and the other entertained as objectional in this respect. Although I did not concur in the propriety of the proposition of the Senator from Tennessee, and although I considered his argument not very happily adjusted to the conclusion it aimed to enforce, yet I must say I decidedly prefer his proposition to the one before us. I would rather admit California and New Mexico into the Union as a State, wholly unfit as I think they are, than to arm the President with despotic powers to govern those territories; not from any distrust of the individual by whom those powers would be exercised, but because I consider such a delegation of authority to any individual utterly indefensible.

The proposition of the Senator from Tennessee is disposed of, and I have therefore not a word to say in respect to it. But there are three other propositions before this body: first, the bill introduced by the select committee, of which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglass] is chairman; second the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin now under immediate consideration; and, third the territorial bill which was received from the House yesterday, and referred to the Committee on Territories this morning. The first creates a State out of a portion of California and admits it into the Union; it also creates the State of New Mexico *in future*, and leaves it out of the Union. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin vests in the President all which a State or territorial goverment ought to posess over both territories. It authorises him to prescribe and establish all proper and needful rules and regulations, in conformity with the Constitution of the United States, to carry into operation the laws referred to in the first part of the proposition, for the preservation of order and tranquillity, and the establishment of justice therein, (not an executive but a creative power,) and from time to time to modify and change said rules and regulations in such a manner as may seem to him desirable and proper. It authorises him to establish offices and to appoint and commission officers, for such terms as he may think proper, and to fix their compensation. It is literally arming him with dictatorial powers. It appears to me to delegate to him nearly in the language of the Constitution, the power under which the authority to establish governments for territories has been claimed. And, sir, if the President elect, on taking into his hands the reins of government, should find himself, in respect to the States, a less absolute ruler than he was at the head of his army, he will, in respect to these territories, be amply indemnified for any diminution of authority he may have sustained by exchanging a military for a civil station. He will find himself in the possession of larger powers than he ever before possessed. I repeat, my objection is not founded on any distrust of the individual by whom these powers are to be exercised. I believe him to posess honesty and truth, the highest ornaments of exalted station. But I will not consent to delegate to any individual, whatever confidence I may have in him, the powers this amendment proposes to confer—"mighty powers," as the mover himself pronounced them.

I forbore, Mr. President, to take any part in the debate while the Senate was in Committee of the Whole, except to urge that all such amendments might be withdrawn. I forebore to make any proposition, by the way of amendment, to that offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, because I believed all such propositions to be out of place. But when this amendment had been adopted by a deliberate vote of the Senate, I prepared a bill—a full territorial bill—with a view to establish a government in California, on the basis of law, with powers clearly defined for the governing, and rights clearly defined for the governed. When the territorial bill was received yesterday from the House, I resolved not to offer mine as an amendment to the bill before us, extremely averse as I am to all of these propositions, in the manner in which they are presented. I hold a territorial government the only proper one to be created for these territories, under a system like ours, excepting for the merest temporary purpose. The object of the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin is more than temporary, whatever its language may import. It has no limitation in point of time. The powers it confers are equally unlimited in scope and duration. And, Mr. President, I am constrained to say, with all deference to the majority of the Senate, I consider it the most objectionable proposition I have been required to vote upon since I have been a member of this body.

Precedents have been cited to sustain this amendment: one in the case of Florida, and the other in that of Louisiana. Now, sir, let me refer to dates to see how far the precedents are applicable to it. The treaty with Spain for the cession of Florida was ratified here on the 22d of February, 1819, and it was to be ratified in six months, or sooner if possible, by the King of Spain.—This was the short session of Congress; and the six months would have brought us to the 22d August, 1819, when Congress was not in session. The act of the 3d March of that year was therefore passed, authorizing the President to take possession of the territory. It was to expire at the end of the next session of Congress; but the treaty was not ratified by the King of Spain until the 24th of October, 1820, and I believe Florida was not taken possession of under this act at all. The treaty as ratified by Spain was sent to the Senate on the 14th February, 1821, as the ratification was not within the time limited. It was ratified by the Senate on the 19th February on that year. The act of the 3d March, 1821, was then passed, re-enacting substantially the act of 3d March, 1819. This was also to expire at the close of the next session of Congress. The Senator from New Jersey stated that Florida was governed about three years under the act of 1819. Am I mistaken?

Mr. Dayton. Two years.

Mr. Dix. The territorial government of Florida, as I have stated, was established on the 30th March, 1822, one year and twenty-seven days after the passage of the act authorizing the President to take possession of the territory.

The Louisiana treaty was ratified by the Senate on the 20th October, 1803. An act was passed on the 31st of the same month, eleven days afterwards, authorising the President to take possession of the territory; and this act was also to expire at the close of the same session of Congress. On the 26th March, 1804, a territorial Government was established, to take effect the 1st October, 1804. The power was exercised in this case eleven months. In both cases, the duration of the act was limited to the close of the same or the ensuing session of Congress. The powers conferred were to expire at a certain period. The want of such a provision in this amendment constitutes one of the strongest objections to it. But even this omission sinks into insignificance when compared with the magnitude of the powers which the amendment confers.

I cannot believe this amendment can receive all the constitutional sanctions necessary to give it the validity of law. I shall, therefore, proceed to examine the other propositions before the Senate, as we may be called upon to act on them when it is too late for discussion.

I wish to avail myself, for a very short time, of the privilege which has been taken by other Senators, of speaking upon the different propositions before us.

The 14th of May, 1787, was the day fixed for the meeting of the Federal Convention by which the Constitution of the United States was framed. A majority of the States was not convened until the 25th of the same month; and nothing was done, with the exception of organising and adopting rules for the orderly transaction of business, until the 28th, when Governor Randolph, of Virginia, to use the language of the Journal, "opened the main business of the session;" or, as he expressed himself, "the great subject of their mission." He spoke of the difficulty of the crisis, the necessity of revising the Federal system, the properties such a Government ought to possess, the defects of the confederation, the dangerous situation of the States, and the remedy. His propositions for the correction and enlargement of the articles of confederation, so as to accomplish the objects of their institution, were stated in a series of resolutions, one of which declared that provisions ought to be made for the admission of States, lawfully arising within the limits of the United States, whether from a voluntary junction of Government and territory or otherwise. He was immediately followed by Mr. Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, who presented a plan of a Federal constitution, in which it was provided that the legislature should have power to admit new States into the Union on the same terms with the original States, provided two-thirds of the members present in both Houses agree. We all know in what manner these propositions were modified in the subsequent proceedings of the convention, and the limitations by which the exercise of the power was guarded by the framers of the constitution. How far the extension of our political jurisdiction beyond the existing boundaries of the States and their territories was in contemplation at that time, I do not stop to inquire. We have given a practical construction to this provision of the constitution. We have admitted into the Union six States, beyond the limits of the thirteen original States and their territories—one an independent nation, and the others colonial dependencies at the time of their acquisition.

The debates in the federal convention, which seems new States from territory we then possessed, show that, even in these cases, the extension of the proposed system, so as to include new members, was deemed a matter of the utmost delicacy and importance, not only as effecting the proper balance of its parts, but in respect to the moral influence of such extension upon the character of the whole. This disposition in the original States to surround the system with all the safeguards necessary to ensure its stability, and to perpetuate the principles on which its foundations were laid, had even an earlier date than the era of the federal constitution. It is shown in the ordinance of the Congress of the confederation, providing for the territory northwest of the Ohio river. The ordinance prescribed rules for the government of that territory, in its moral as well as its political relations; and it imposed upon the admission of the States to be formed out of it, in respect to representation, conditions more onerous than those which were annexed by the Federal convention to the representations of the thirteen original States. These exactions and conditions all had for their object to maintain the purity of the system, the homogeneousness of its parts, and the harmony of its movements. They looked to training and discipline in the school of representative government before the communities which were to be incorporated into the Union were raised to the dignity and equality of sovereign States.

Sir, I hold to this prudence and caution in the founders of the republic. I believe it to be due to ourselves, to the institutions they framed, and to the future millions whose destiny for good or for evil is in some degree to be wrought out in our political action.

I deduce, then, from the organisation of the Government, this practical principle, which I hold to be fundamental: that no state ought to be admitted into the Union which has not been prepared by a familiar knowledge of the theory and practice of our political system, and by such a training in the discipline to free institutions as to render its participation in the administration of the general concerns an aid and an advantage, not an embarrassment and an obstacle, to the steady action of the system.

This requirement, which I consider absolute, is not fulfilled by the condition of California. The bill reported by the select committee admits that territory into the Union at once as a Sovereign State. That, too, was the purport of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, though it embraced New Mexico also. This proposition is directly opposed to all the practical rules and usages of the republic, from its foundation to the present day. It is in palpable violation of the principles I have stated as inherent in the organisation of the Federal Government. It discards all the prudential considerations which entered into the reasonings of the framers of the Constitution concerning the extension of our political system.

Let me state some of the leading objections to it as they relate to the condition of California: 1. Its present inhabitants are, to a considerable extent, Indians or Mexicans of mixed blood. 2. They are, for the most part, uneducated. 3. They are not sufficiently familiar with the business of self-government. 4. They do not even speak our language. 5. They would not come into the Union with an enlightened understanding of the principles of our political system, or with the general cultivation and intelligence essential to such a fulfilment of the duties and responsibilities of the American citizen as to render them safe participants in the administration of the Government. I need not enlarge upon these propositions. Those who are familiar with the condition of California and the character of the people will assent to their truth. I hold these objections to the immediate admission of California into the Union as a State—objections drawn from the character and condition of the people—to be insuperable. I know very well that territory is rapidly filling up, and that it is receiving, from us thousands of citizens, active, enterprising, and of unexceptional character. But we know also that it is receiving multitudes of adventurers from almost every quarter of the globe—from both hemispheres—from Oceanica to the European continent and islands—some for a permanent abode, but more for mere temporary purposes. I wish to see this heterogeneous mass pass through the process of fermentation, to which it is destined, and settle down into something like consistence, before we undertake to endow it with all the attributes of self-government.

This view of the subject is sustained by the uniform practice of the government. 1. Our alien laws have always prescribed a period of probation for individuals who come among us for a permanent abode, and to unite their fortunes to ours. This period has always been of several years duration. The most liberal (and of these I have always been one) have never proposed to dispense altogether with the probationary term. The only question is as to its proper extent.

It proceeds upon the principle, admitted by all, that no man shall become a member of our political association until he has been taught by experience to appreciate its advantages and

after its acquisition. I know that numbers had something to do with this delay; but other considerations doubtless had their influence also. These territories were both foreign; and, when acquired, their inhabitants were presumed to have but little knowledge of the theory or practice of our political institutions.

But, even with our own territories and our own people we have dealt with the same caution and the same prudent regard to the privileges which an admission into the Union confers. Instead of curtailing the period of probation, where Congress had a discretion, we have rather been disposed to insist on a rigid fulfilment of the prescribed conditions, both in respect to number and time.

The ordinance of 1787, by which the division of the territory northwest of the Ohio river into States and the ultimate incorporation of those States into the Union, were provided for, fixed sixty thousand free inhabitants as the number necessary to their admission; but it was provided also that, so far as it should consist with the general interest of the confederacy, such admission might be allowed at an earlier period, and with a less number of inhabitants. Yet Ohio was not admitted into the Union until 1802. It must have had sixty thousand inhabitants; and it was admitted with a single member of Congress. At the same time the ratio of representation in Congress was one member for thirty-three thousand inhabitants.

Indiana was admitted in 1816, Illinois in 1818, Michigan in 1837, and Wisconsin a year ago. These territories were settled chiefly by our own people. The settlers came from the old States. They were nurtured in the love of liberty, and trained to the exercise of political rights. All their associations were of a character to render them safe depositories of the priceless treasure of freedom. Yet they were subjected to a protracted probation. They were held in political subjection not only in respect to the appointment of their chief executive officers, but in the more delicate relation of supervising and overruling them in the exercises of the power of legislation. Such, Mr. President, has been our practice not only in respect to territories acquired by treaties with foreign powers, but in respect to our own people occupying territories held by a tenure coeval with our political independence. The bill reported by the select committee proposes to overthrow and reverse the uniform practice of the country in this essential particular. The practice assumes that some familiarity with the duties and privileges of citizenship is necessary for the inhabitants of a territory as a preparation for the independent management of their public affairs. It supposes that a territorial government founded upon principles and administered according to laws analogous to those which govern the State administrations should precede the admission of a territory into the Union. It holds the privileges, the responsibilities, the rights incident to an independent membership of the political association, into which the States have entered, to be of too great a value to be communicated to other communities without a just regard to their capacity for assuming and exercising them with advantage to others as well as to themselves.

The bill discards all these considerations. California has not yet been acquired a single year; nine months ago it was foreign territory. Its population is foreign, its interests, associations, usages, laws, and institutions are in a great degree, alien to our own. The people do not even speak our language; they cannot read our constitution or laws without translating them into a foreign tongue. Yet the committee propose to admit it into the Union on the footing of the original States, and to give it a weight in this body equal to that of Virginia, or Pennsylvania, or New York. With a population perhaps of twenty thousand souls, it is to wield here an influence equal to that of New York with three millions.

I cannot consent to cheapen in this manner an independent membership in the union of the States. I believe it to be unjust to the present members of the Union, hazardous to the stability of the Government, a departure from a wise and well-considered policy, and unjust, as I shall endeavour to show, to California herself.

Independent alike each of our own concerns as the intellectual and moral. Her population is scattered over a vast surface; her improvements are not such as to give stability to her political organisation; she has no commerce; she has hardly emerged from the pastoral state and risen to the grade of an agricultural community.—She has not the strength to uphold an independent sovereignty. The recent discoveries of gold have made a bad condition worse; they have dissolved, for the time being, the very bonds of society. It will require months, if not years, to restore order, to bring back her people to the sober pursuits of industry, and to qualify them for any deliberate purpose. I believe there never was a community less fitted than California is at this moment, and under existing circumstances, to organise a government and put it in operation. All the influences which are at work with the minds and passions of men are to the last degree unfavourable to the high duty the bill imposes on them. When all the obligations which bind men to the performance of their duty appear to have lost their force: when ships are abandoned by their crews; when soldiers desert by platoons and companies; when villages and towns are depopulated; and when the whole community is possessed by the phrenzy of gold digging, and lose sight of all other objects, we call upon them to meet in solemn conclave and perform the highest and most responsible of all deliberative acts—that of framing a constitution for their own government—a work of deliberation and soberness and calm reflection. I have been from the beginning opposed to this whole scheme. I believe, if ever there was an occasion, since the foundations of this republic were laid, when it was incumbent upon Congress to establish a temporary government for a territory, to provide for its wants, to give direction to its action, and to sustain it by the collective wisdom and strength of the whole community, until it shall have passed through the period of probation to which all our territories have been subjected—a period rendered doubly perilous there by the prevailing disorganisation—that occasion is presented in the condition of California.

I am in favour, then, of a territorial government, endowed with the energy to control and remedy existing embarrassments and evils. I believe the course proper in all similar cases is preëminently proper in this. I shall concur in no other, unless it be for a mere temporary purpose. And it was with great regret that I heard honourable Senators say there was no hope of giving California a territorial government. I do not concur in opinion with them. I will not relinquish hope until the last moment. The most certain mode of giving effect to a feeling of hopelessness is to despair of the battle before it is fought, and resort to other devices to supply our own want of constancy and courage.

The objections I have stated to this bill are insuperable; they are fundamental, and therefore not to be obviated. There are objections of detail, which may be remedied; but I will merely state, without enlarging upon them—as no variation in the details can reconcile me to the general purpose of the bill—the immediate admission of California into the Union as a State.

Of these objections I consider the dismemberment of California one of the most serious. I would keep that territory as it is until the spread of population and the growth of improvement shall indicate where the division can be drawn with least prejudice to the parties concerned. The bill proposes a chain of mountains as the eastern boundary. Sir, physical obstacles are not always the most appropriate or convenient for statistical division.—Moral obstacles are more powerful to repel, and moral affinities more powerful to attract, than physical. Identity or diversity of race, association, or condition, often does more than rivers, and mountains, and plains, to bind men together or force them asunder. What is there, for instance, in the class of natural obstacles more appropriate for a statistical demarcation than the Alleghany mountions? And yet they have not sufficed to divide Virginia into two distinct communities. Nor have they sufficed to divide Pennsylvania into two States. What is there more suitable for such a purpose than the Chesapeake bay? And yet Maryland lies on both sides of it. If we were to look to physical obstacles as constituting the most appropriate boundary for California on the east, we ought to stop at the Sierra Nevada, which is more elevated than the boundary of the committee "the dividing ridge separating the waters flowing into the Colorada from those flowing into the Great Basin," or we ought to go on to the Sierra Madre, and leave the territory with its present limits. We need not consider geographical extent as an objection to the organisation of a territorial government. When Louisiana was acquired, we placed all that part of it north of the thirty-third parallel of latitude under the direction of the governor and judges of the Indiana territory, for the purposes of government and the administration of justice; and it had a more extended area than California.

Let us leave statistical divisions to be fixed by events. The movement of population, physical development, social progress, and their incidents—these are the great causes which mark out permanent boundaries between separate States. Let us leave California to be filled up, and the races which occupy it can better determine than we who shall live apart and who together.

The disposition which this bill makes of New Mexico, I consider, if possible, still more objectionable. She was known long before the era of Von Humboldt as having a distinct organisation. In connection with Durango and Chihuahua, she constituted an independent member of the Mexican confederation under the constitutive act of 1824, and a separate territory under the constitution of that year. The consolidation of the confederated States into a central republic, under the Constitution of 1836, made her a separate department with an independent organisation for the management of her local concerns. We have held commercial intercourse with her under laws applying only to her self and another member of the Mexican Republic. She has had an individual name, existence, and organisation. So far as I am concerned, they shall be respected. I will neither consent that she shall be dismembered nor merged in a more extended organisation. Subjection by conquest is the greatest humiliation that can befall a community. The magnanimity of the conquerors should spare the subjugated State the further humiliation of dismemberment, or the obliteral on of its identity in a useless extension. I will neither consent to play towards New Mexico the part of Austria, Russia, and Prussia towards Poland, or the part of the Holy Alliance towards Genoa. I will neither agree that she shall be divided nor swallowed up. She has petitioned to us to save her from dismemberment. I am for exercising our power over her with humanity as well as forbearance—for conforming, as far as we can, to the wish of the vanquishe . I believe she is now, considering all circumstances, as well fitted to come into the Union as California. I will not consent to dilute what fitness for self-government she possesses by a territorial expansion, of which I can neither comprehend the object nor forsee the result.

But it is not quite clear, from the language of the bill, what is to be the fate of New Mexico—whether she is to be merged wholly or in part in Texas, or merely drawn out to the Pacific. If the latter—and I suppose this to be the intention of the committee—she will be stretched out some two or three hundred miles westward on the North, and eight or nine hundred on the south. But the New Mexico created by the bill is to be bounded on the east by the summit of the Rocky Mountains and the State of Texas. The Rocky Mountains, or the Sierra Madre, a continuation of them are now the western boundary of New Mexico. I am not sure whether they would not under this bill become the western boundary of Texas. I I am not sure that New Mexico would not be merged in Texas by the mere designation of a boundary line. The bill seems to me, by a literal construction of its terms, to accomplish these three objects, alike objectionable in my mind: 1. The annexation of New Mexico to Texas. 2. The dismemberment of California. And, 3d, the creation of a new State of New Mexico, wholly within the limits of California, and wholly without the limits of the present New Mexico.

Nor is this all. While the bill introduces California into the Union, it leaves New Mexico out of it. We consent that it shall become a State of the Union, with the name and style of the State of New Mexico, as soon as it shall have the proper number of inhabitants. What is the proper number of inhabitants? Louisiana was admitted into the Union with about eighty thousand; (I speak in round numbers;) Ohio with about sixty thousand; Illinois with forty thousand; Michigan with one hundred and fifty thousand, and Florida with perhaps forty thousand white persons. Where is the criterion of proper numbers sought for? Is it in the ratio of the representation in Congress? Why not say so, if it be intended? The greater portion of this territory is nearly unpopulated. It is not likely, either from its position or physical character, to be populated rapidly. What is to be its political condition until it has the proper number of inhabitants? It cannot be admitted into the Union until then. What is to become of it in the mean time? To what political category does it belong? Is it not to be a territory. The bill makes no provision for it as such. We merely cut it off from California and leave it to the uncertain progress of events and the still more uncertain phraseology of our own statute.

We cast it away, to use a barbarous law phrase, "*a flotsam*" on the ocean of politics—"*incautum quo fata ferata*"—to reclaim it to ourselves at some future day, if we can find it first, and agree afterwards on the meaning of our own enactment.

I am opposed to this whole scheme; it seems to me to have been dictated by a desire to avoid embarrassing questions. I trust I appreciate rightly the motives of honourable Senators. But I hold that there is always more embarrassment in postponing or evading troblesome questions than in meeting them boldly, and disposing of them promptly when they present themselves. I propose to myself but two inquiries in reference to the course we ought to adopt. 1. What does the interest of the country, and 2. What does the interest of California and New Mexico require? The answer seems too clear to be mistaken. I have already given it. Both considerations point to a territorial government, framed on proper principles.

What shall these principles be? This is the only question which remains to be considered. Recognising, as I do, to the fullest extent, the democratic doctrine of instructions, I am not altogether a free agent in this matter. During the last three years resolutions have been as presented here by myself, bearing that New York may acquired from Mexico, Slavery ought to be prohibited. I have endeavoured to carry out the instructions by which these resolutions were accompanied. I have done so with the more cheerfulness, because, apart from all obligation of obedience, I believe them just.

I hold, then that territorial governments ought to be organised for California and New Mexico, and that the act establishing them should contain a prohibition of Slavery. I believe there never was an occasion in which such a prohibition was demanded by higher obligations than the present. I shall endeavour to make it apparent to the judgment of the Senate, and for this reason I shall be under the necessity of entering into a brief review of the origin and progress of Slavery in the United States; and I shall begin with the condition of the American colonies before the establishment of their independence

Slavery, I believe, was never originally established by law in any State in this Union, nor was it so established in the British colonies of America. The relation of master and slave, in modern times and in civilised States, usually springs up in the transactions of commerce, without positive authority, and the law afterwards comes in to regulate it. It was so in the American colonies. It is a curious fact that the same year (1620) which witnessed the landing of the Pilgrims on the Rock of Plymouth, saw the first ship enter the waters of the Chesapeake Bay and the James River, with Africans, to be sold into Slavery. It is still more curious that the ship freighted with freemen and the ship freighted with slaves commenced their voyages, from the same country—Holland. In the same year, the monopoly of the London company was overturned, and the commerce of the colony of Virginia was thrown open to free competition.

The introduction of slaves into that colony was one of the first fruits of this commercial freedom—not necessarily, but as one of those incidents which the chances of life bring with them to illustrate its uncertainties and its contradictions. There was no law in Virginia at that time authorising the existence of Slavery; nor was there any such law in England. It gained a foothold without law. Indeed, the early enactments of the colony of Virginia had for their objects to restrain the introduction of slaves, and to limit the control of their masters over them. Before the revolution, she petitioned the British king to sanction the measures she had adopted for the suppression of the Slave Trade. The appeal was vain. It was the interest of British traders who derived a mercenary profit from this detestable traffic, that it should continue; and down to the period of the Revolution every effort on the part of Virginia and the other colonies to put a stop to it was fruitless. Slavery was thus forced upon us by Great Britain; we are not responsible for its origin. In the North it has been abolished. In the South peculiar circumstances have continued it in existence. I make no inquiry into these circumstances, or their necessary influence upon the result. The responsibility which rests upon us is to see that it is not further extended—that it shall not, as far as depends on us, be planted where it never existed, or where it has been abolished.

After the termination of the war with great Britain, when the American colonies, to use the language of the Declaration of Independence, had "assumed among the powers of the earth the equal and separate station to which the laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitled them," the attention of the great men of the country was turned to the subject of Slavery; not only with a view to its exclusion from the unoccupied portions of the Union, but with a view to its extinction in the States where it existed. The definitive treaty of peace with Great Britain, acknowledging our Independence, was signed in September, 1783. In March, 1784, Mr. Jefferson introduced into the Congress of the confederation a plan of a temporary government for the territory northwest of the Ohio river, containing a provision abolishing Slavery after the year 1800, in that territory, now comprising the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

The Anti-Slavery clause received the votes of six States out of the ten present in Congress. Under the articles of confederation the delegates voted by States; and by the same articles a majority of the thirteen States was requisite to carry any proposition. Mr. Jefferson's proposition, having received only six votes, was not adopted.

I hold in my hand, Mr. President, a copy of his plan for a temporary government for the northwest territory, made from the original, which I found a few weeks ago, among the archives of the confederation, in the State Department, where they are deposited. [Appendix No. 1.] The original is in the clear, careful handwriting of Mr. Jefferson, and it settles the question of authorship. It divides the territory into ten States instead of five, as was finally determined; and it contains the Anti-Slavery clause to which I have referred, and which has heretofore been attributed to him. I will read it for the information of the Senate. Like some other propositions of a kindred character, and of later date, it is in the form of a proviso:

"After the year 1800 of the Christian era there shall be neither Slavery or involuntary servitude in any of the said States, otherwise than in punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall been duly convicted to have been personally guilty."—[Appendix No. 2.]

I am happy to have had it in my power to refer this declaration to the author of an earlier declaration in favour of human freedom—I mean that of our independence—and to have found it in his own handwriting. Without this testimony, no one could doubt, on reading the whole paper, that he was the author. It contains internal evidences of authorship which, to any one familiar with his style of composition, and his peculiarity of thought, must be conclusive. Let it be known henceforth as the Jefferson proviso. As such, it will at least escape the imputation of selfish motives, from which, in the prevailing heat of party contention, no follower in the same field can hope to be exempt, however unjustly they may be attributed to him. I have already said that this proposition failed for the want of a single vote. It was renewed in 1785, by Rufus King, then representing the State of Massachusetts, and it was referred to a committee, though it was not finally acted upon at that time. The reference was made by the votes of eight States out of eleven present, one State being absent, and another represented by a single delegate, and therefore not entitled, according to the articles of confederation to vote.—[Appendix No 3.]

Thus things remained until 1787, when the ordinance of that year was passed establishing a government for the Northwestern Territory, and prohibiting Slavery within it forever, except for crimes. This ordinance was reported by a committee, of which Mr. Edward Carrington, of Virginia, was chairman, and Mr. Nathan Dane, of Massachusetts, a leading member. It received the votes of all the States present. It was a unanimous vote as to States, and unanimous, with a single exception, as to delegates. There were only eight States present, viz: Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia. The five absent States were New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania and Maryland. The four first—New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Pennsylvania—voted for Mr. Jefferson's proviso in 1784, and Maryland voted to refer Mr. King's proposition in 1785. [Appendix, No. 4.]

Thus, I think, it may be fairly asserted, that if all the States had been represented in Congress, the vote would have been equally unanimous. The ordinance would have been adopted by the votes of the thirteen States.

The South united with the North in excluding Slavery from this territory. It was a unanimous verdict of the whole country against the extension of Slavery. It was the first great movement of our revolutionary fathers to rid themselves of the responsibility, and the country of the evil of Slavery. And I take great pleasure in awarding to a Southern man, Thomas Jefferson, the conception of this great measure of justice and humanity.

While the Congress of the confederation, sitting in New York, was framing the ordinance, in 1787, the Federal Convention, sitting in Philadelphia, was framing the Constitution of the United States. While the former body was devising measures for the exclusion of Slavery from the northwestern Territory, the latter was engaged in providing for the suppression of the African slave trade. Thus, the representatives of the newborn republic, legislating for the government, and framing a new system for the better administration of their common concerns—sitting in different places, and acting in separate capacities—were jointly engaged in eradicating what they considered a great public evil and reproach. While the former declared that Slavery should henceforth be prohibited in the Northwestern Territory, the latter virtually declared (though in the form of a restriction on the exercise of a power) the American slave trade should cease after the year 1807. It would have been abolished at once but for the opposition of South Carolina and Georgia, the only States which were at that time desirous of continuing it.

In the Federal Convention, Virginia was among the foremost in her opposition to the slave trade. Madison and Mason and Randolph were distinguished for the ability and zeal with which they advocated its immediate suppression. They were unwilling to wait twenty years for its abolition. But their efforts were unavailing; and, for fear South Carolina and Georgia would not come into the Union, a compromise was agreed on, and the traffic was tolerated until 1808. On the first day of January of that year, the very first day Congress had power to make its prohibition effective, the slave trade was abolished forever by an act passed ten months before.

I have stated these historical details, Mr. President, for the purpose of showing two facts: 1. That the policy of the founders of the republic was to get rid of Slavery, by preventing its extension, and by suppressing the African slave trade; and 2. That some of the Southern States were among the foremost in advocating both measures, with a view to the accomplishment of the ultimate object. One of the avowed objects of the abolition of the slave trade was, to prevent the extension of Slavery into the territories. The same policy prevailed for many years. The inhabitants of the Northwest territory, or a portion of it, (that portion, I believe, which now constitutes the States of Indiana and Illinois,) petitioned Congress for the privilege of importing slaves from the States; and they had sufficient influence in Congress to obtain two reports in favour of a temporary suspension of the sixth article of the ordinance of 1787. But their prayer was not granted. The inhabitants of Louisiana, before the abolition of the slave trade, petitioned for the privilege of importing slaves. Their prayer was denied. Wherever Congress had the power, it was exercised to prevent the extension of Slavery beyond the States and Territories in which it existed.

I have always been opposed to interference with Slavery where it exists. The Federal Government has no control over it, directly or indirectly, within the limits of the States. It is a civil relation over which they have exclusive jurisdiction. It must ever rest with them to determine whether it shall be continued or abolished within their limits. But it is not so with the territories. Congress has always exercised the power of regulating their civil as well as their political relations. The territorial governments are the creatures of federal legislation; they have no powers except those conferred on them by Congress. Congress stands to the inhabitants of the territories in the relation in which the State legislatures stand to the people of the States. The power of regulating the internal concerns of the inhabitants of the territories has been exercised under every administration since the adoption of the Constitution.

Sir, I hold the exercise of this power for the exclusion of Slavery from California and New Mexico, to be even of higher obligation than it was in respect to the Northwestern Territory. Slavery existed in that territory at the time the ordinance of 1787 was framed and passed. The tenure of slaves owned by the inhabitants of the territory, and held within it, was sanctioned by the courts. The prohibition was construed to extend only to persons born or brought into the territory subsequently to the adoption of the ordinance.

The situation of California and New Mexico is entirely different. Mexico long since abolished Slavery throughout her dominions. It was practically proclaimed by President Guerrero in 1829, in pursuance, as the decree declared, of extraordinary powers vested in him. It was again declared to be abolished by an act of the sovereign Congress in 1837, and again by the Constitution of 1844. Though, as a nation, but imperfectly civilised, struggling against the embarrassment of bad government, and distracted by internal dissensions, arising, in a great degree, out of the heterogoneous character of her population, Mexico has, nevertheless, placed her institutions on the broad foundation of human liberty, by declaring all within her limits to be free.

To permit Slavery to be carried into California and New Mexico would be to annul this declaration, and to re-establish Slavery where it has been abolished. I cannot consent to any settlement of this question which can by possibility have such a result.

Mr. BERRIEN.—I desire to inquire of the Senator from New York, if he intends to assert that the proclamation of President Guerrero was issued under any power specially delegated to him in reference to this subject?

Mr. DIX.—I will answer the Senator with pleasure. I take the decree as I find it. I said that the first public declaration was made by President Guerrero in 1829, in pursuance, as his decree stated, of extraordinary powers conceded to him. I am under no obligation to inquire further in relation to the matter, or to look behind the act for the authority on which it was founded.

Mr. BERRIEN.—I ask the question with a view of ascertaining whether the Senator was disposed to contend that Slavery was abolished in New Mexico by virtue of any other power than this proclamation?

Mr. DIX.—I suppose it was abolished by virtue of the authority on which the decree was made. I have the decree, and will read it, if the Senator from Georgia desires it.

Mr. BERRIEN.—The Senator is not aware, perhaps, of the fact, that the power granted to the President was given him for the purpose of repelling invasion, and had no other object. I would propound another question. If Slavery was abolished by force of the proclamation of President Guerero in 1829, what Slavery remained in Mexico to be abolished by the act of the sovereign Congress, and whence did the sovereign Congress derive the power to do that which belonged to the municipal authorities of the several States exclusively?

Mr. DIX.—I prefer not to answer the inquiry of the Senator; it will require a diversion from the course of my remarks, which I do not care to make. [Appendix No. 5.] I repeat—the first public declaration that Slavery was abolished was made in 1829; the next by the Congress of 1837, and re-affirmed by the Constitution of 1844. I do not design now to go beyond the limits of these executive, legislative, and constitutional acts, to inquire into the authorities upon which they rested. I stated, when I was interrupted, that the effect of carrying Slavery into California would be to subvert the prohibition contained in these acts. This is the first great objection. The second is, that it would be unjust to the community at large, by promoting the multiplication of a race which adds neither to the intellectual nor physical power of the community, and which excludes free labour as far as it extends the labour of slaves. I consider this one of the greatest objections to it. It should be our object to promote, in every constitutional way, the extension of free labour, and the most effectual mode is to devote the unoccupied spaces of the West to the white race. The third objection is, that it would be unjust to California and New Mexico. They have no slaves, I believe I am authorised to say they desire none.

Mr. FOOTE.—I would inquire of the Senator from New York if he considers that any injustice will result to California and New Mexico by allowing the people of those territories to do with this matter as they please?

Mr. DIX.—I am in favour of doing what the fathers of the Republic did in relation to the Northwestern Territory; of preventing the extension to California of what they considered, and what I consider, a great evil. If we carry Slavery into Mexico and California, we shall do it against the wishes of the people there. They have no slaves now, and we should plant Slavery where it does not exist. We should stand before the world in the same relation in which Great Britain stood to her American colonies. She allowed Slavery to be carried into those colonies against their wishes and, in some instances, against their earnest remonstrances.

The introduction of Slavery into California and New Mexico, as I conceive, would be more indefensible, as there is nothing in the soil or climate which renders the labour of the African race necessary; nothing that makes it unsafe or oppressive for whites to be employed in productive industry under any of its forms. New Mexico consists for the most part, of mountains, with narrow valleys between, which require to be watered by artificial means. There is no need of the African race. A large portion of California is elevated and broken. It yields nothing to the production of which slave labour is even claimed to be indispensable. Much of the value of that territory consists in the maritime valley which lies on the Pacific. It is about five hundred miles long, and one hundred and five wide, with an area of some seventy-five thousand square miles. The breezes from the Pacific moderate the temperature, and the mountains on the east, rising to the height of thousands of feet, collect and precipitate the moisture of the atmosphere, and pour it down in fertilizing streams into the valley below. It is said by Fremont to bear a strong resemblance to Italy in soil, climate, and capacity for production. It is, perhaps the finest region of the same extent in the Western Hemisphere. The vine, the olive, and the fig, the infinite variety of fruits and grains which are produced within the tropics, are to be found in California. Nature, has, in a word, lavished upon it her choicest gifts. In the recent discoveries of gold, there is much to be deplored. Let us hope that it will soon become exhausted, and that steady pursuits of agricultural, commercial, and mechanical industry, by which alone nations are made prosperous, may constitute the sole objects of application. There is no need of blacks in California; the white race can labour there without difficulty. The productions are such as to require the intelligence of the more intellectual race. It would be a perversion of the purposes of nature, in more senses than one, to carry slaves there.

I believe this will be the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, but not by virtue of any right conferred by the Constitution. I do not acknowledge the existence of any such right. I speak of practical effects. Slaves have been carried, and always will be carried, wherever they are not prohibited. Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri are in the same range of States. The fortieth parallel of latitude divides them all. The influences of soil and climate are much the same in each. From the three first Slavery has been excluded by the ordinance of 1787. The last has been overrun with Slavery for want of a prohibition. The fate of California in this respect will be settled by similar laws. I believe we shall by the amendment under consideration lay the foundation of a contest among the inhabitants of California far more disastrous than their present disorganisation. I hold it to be our duty to settle this question ourselves, instead of sending it out to the Pacific to distract our countrymen in laying the foundation of a new government.

I have but one more consideration to present in connexion with this topic; and I submit whether this ought not to weigh much with us all? When the war with Mexico was commenced we were charged with the intention of acquiring territory with a view to carry slaves into it. The charge was denied. We repelled the imputation as doing injustice to our motives. Yet, in the very first attempt to establish a government for that territory, the right is insisted upon—the purpose is confessed. Whether the Mexican Government was aware of this imputation I do not know; but, in the negotiation with Mr. Trist, the Mexican commissioners wished us to stipulate not to carry Slavery into the territory which was proposed to be ceded.

Mr. FOOTE. Will the honourable Senator from New York allow me to propound a question to him? That question is this: Who, from the South, either here or elsewhere has avowed any such purpose? Had Southern Senators insisted upon anything but that Congress shall not legislate on the subject of Slavery in the territories at all? Have we asked Congress to legislate for the introduction of Slavery, or avowed any purpose of doing anything except to resist unconstitutional encroachment?

Mr. DIX. I was speaking of an avowed purpose to carry slaves into California; and I thought I understood the Senator from Mississippi not only as asserting the right, but as supporting his argument by contending that a portion of the country was likely to become a slaveholding region.

Mr. FOOTE. I said this, on that point: It is well known that Slavery is adapted to only a small portion of this territory. Believing this to be the case I urged that the moderation and forbearance of the South, in order to establish a territorial government affording protection to the people of these territories, is strikingly exhibited in her not urging her right, in any shape or form, to be authorised specially by law to carry slaves there. We ask nothing of it to *be let alone*.

Mr. DIX. I cannot consent to go into this discussion now. I said that whether the Mexican Government was aware of the imputation cast upon us I did not know, but that in the negotiation with Mr. Trist the Mexican commissioners wished us to stipulate that we should not allow Slavery to be established in any territory they should cede to us. I will read a brief extract from a letter addressed by Mr. Trist to Mr. Buchanan upon this subject, while the negotiation was pending. It is dated the 4th of September, 1847, and is contained in a document printed by order of the Senate:

"Among the points which came under discussion was the exclusion of Slavery from all territory which should pass from Mexico. In the course of their remarks on the subject, I was told that if it were proposed to the people of the United States to part with a portion of their territory in order that the *ingerition* should be therein established, the proposal could not excite stronger feelings of abhorrence than those awakened to Mexico by the prospect of the introduction of Slavery in any territory parted with by her."

I could make no comment on this correspondence, if I were disposed, which would be half so eloquent as the facts. These Mexicans, whom we have been accustomed to consider half civilised, vanquished in the field, driven from their capital, compelled to make peace with us almost on our own terms, and forced to cede a portion of their territory, implore us not to carry Slavery into it. Sir, I ask how should we stand before the world, liberal and enlightened as we are, proclaiming to mankind the principle of human liberty as one of the inalienable rights of our race, if we were to disregard these entreaties?

Mr. Mason. Does the Senator refer to the petition which has been presented from New Mexico?

Mr. DIX. No, sir, I refer to Mr. Trist's negotiation with Mexico, and the representations made to him during an interview with the Mexican commissioners.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to ask the honourable Senator whether he does not know that the Mexican commissioners negotiated the treaty under the influence of an agent of the British Government.

Mr. DIX. I suppose there can be no doubt that the treaty is in strict accordance with the feelings and wishes of the Mexican people on this subject. Their repeated declarations in respect to the abolition of Slavery prove it, under whatever influence the treaty may have been framed.

Mr. President, two years ago, when I first addressed the Senate upon this subject, under the instructions of the State of New York, I said that, by no instrumentality of hers, should Slavery be carried into any portion of this continent which is free. I repeat the declaration now; by no act, by no acquiescence of hers, shall Slavery be carried where it does not exist. I said at the same time that, in whatever manner this question should be settled, if it should be decided against the views of justice and right, her devotion to the Union and her fidelity to her sister States should remain unshaken and unimpaired. Speaking in her name, and for the last time within these walls, I repeat the declaration now.—She does not believe in the possibility of disunion. I am thankful that her faith is also mine. My confidence is founded upon the disinterestedness of the great body of the people who derive their subsistence from the soil, and whose attachment is strong in proportion to their close communion with it. They have incorporated with it the labour of their own hands. It has given them back wealth and health and strength—health to enjoy and strength to defend what they possess. In seasons of tranquility and peace they are unseen; too often, perhaps, forgotten; but it is in their silent and sober toil that the public prosperity is wrought out. It is only in the hour of peril that they come forth from a thousand hills and valleys and plains to sustain with strong arms the country they have made prosperous. In them the Union will find its surest protectors. They are too virtuous and too independent to be corrupted. They are spread over too broad a surface for the work of seduction. It is in towns and public assemblies, where men are concentrated, that the tempter can with more assurance sit down, as of old, in the guise of friendship, and whisper into the unsuspecting or the willing ear the lesson of disobedience and treachery. From this danger the great body of the people are secure. And let us be assured, that they will never permit the banner which floats over them at home, and carries their name to every sea, to be torn down, either by internal dissension or external violence. Such is my firm, my unalterable conviction. But, if I am mistaken in all this—if the spangled field it bears aloft is destined to be broken up—then my prayer will be, that the star which represents New York in the constellation of States may stand fixed until every other shall have fallen!

APPENDIX No. 1.

The following is a copy of Mr. Jefferson's plan:

The committee appointed to prepare a plan for the temporary government of the Western Territory, have agreed to the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the territory ceded or to be ceded by individual States to the United States, whensoever the same shall have been purchased from the Indian inhabitants, and offered for sale by the United States, shall be formed into distinct States, bounded in the following manner, as nearly as such cessions will admit—that is to say: northwardly and southwardly by parallel of latitude, so that each State shall comprehend from South to North, two degrees of latitude, beginning to count from the completion of thirty-one degrees north of the equator; but any territory northwardly of the forty seventh degree shall make part of the State next below; and eastwardly and westwardly they shall be bounded, those on the Mississippi by that river on one side and the meridian of the lowest point of the rapids of the Ohio on the other; and those adjoining on the east by the same meridian on their western side, and on the eastern by the western cape of the mouth of the Great Kanawha; and the territory eastward of this last meridian between the Ohio, Lake Erie, and Pennsylvania, shall be one State.

That the settlers within the territory so to be purchased and offered for sale, shall, either on their own petition, or on the order of Congress, receive authority from them, with appointments of time and place for their free males, of full age, to meet together for the purpose of establishing a temporary government, to adopt the Constitution and laws of any one of these States, so that such laws nevertheless shall be subject to alteration by their ordinary legislature; and to erect, subject to a like alteration, counties or townships for the election of members for their Legislatures.

That such temporary government shall only continue in force in any State until it shall have acquired twenty thousand free inhabitants; when, giving due proof thereof to Congress, they shall receive from them authority, with appointments of time and place, to call a convention of representatives to establish a permanent constitution and government for themselves: Provided, That both the temporary and permanent governments be established on these principles as their basis: 1. [That they shall forever remain a part of the United States of America:] 2. That, in their persons, property, and territory, they shall be subject to the Government of the United States in Congress assembled, and to the Articles of Confederation in all those cases in which the original States shall be so subject; 3. That they hall be subject to pay a part of the federal debts contracted or to be contracted, to be apportioned on them by Congress according to the same common rule and measure by which apportionments thereof shall be made on the other States; 4. That their respective governments shall be in republican forms, and shall admit no person to be a citizen who holds any hereditary title; 5. That after the year 1900 of the Christian era there shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the said States, otherwise than in punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted to have been personally guilty.

That whensoever any of the States shall have, of free inhabitants, as many as shall then be in any one of the least numerous of the thirteen original States, such States shall be admitted by its delegates into the Congress of the United States on an equal footing with the said original States; after which the assent of two-thirds of the United States in Congress assembled shall be requisite in all those cases wherein by the confederation, the assent of nine States is now required: Provided, The consent of nine States to such admission may be obtained according to the eleventh of the articles of confederation. Until such admission, by their delegates into Congress, any of the said States, after the establishment of their temporary government, shall have authority to keep a sitting member in Congress, with right of debating, but not of voting.

That the territory northward of the forty-fifth degree, that is to say, of the completion of forty-five degrees from the equator, and extending to the Lake of the Woods, shall be called Sylvania.

That of the territory under the forty-fifth and forty-fourth degrees, that which lies westward of Lake Michigan shall be called Michigania; and that which is eastward thereof within the peninsula formed by the lakes and waters of Michigan, Huron, St. Clair, and Erie, shall be called Cherronesus, and shall include any part of the peninsula which may extend above the forty-fifth degree.

Of the territory under the forty-fourth and forty-second degrees, that to the westward, through which the Assenisipi or Rock river runs, shall be called Assenisipia; and that to the eastward, in which are the fountains of the Muskingum, the two Miamies of the Ohio, in the Wabash, the Illinois the Miami of the Lake, and Sandusky rivers, shall be called Metropotamia.

Of the territory which lies under the forty-first and fortieth degrees, the western, through which the river runs, shall be called Illinoia; that next adjoining to the eastward Sarratoga; and that between this last and Pennsylvania, and extending from the Ohio to Lake Erie, shall be called Washington.

Of the territory which lies under the thirty-ninth and thirty eighth degrees, to which shall be added so much of the point of land within the fork of the Ohio and Mississippi as lies under the thirty-seventh degree, that to the westward, within and adjacent to which are the head waters of the rivers Wabash, Shawanee, Tunisee, Ohio, Illinois, Mississippi and Missouri, shall be called Polypotamia; and that to the eastward, further up the Ohio, otherwise called the Pelisipi, shall be called Pelisipia.

That the preceding articles shall be formed into a character of compact, shall be duly executed by the President of the United States in Congress assembled, under his hand and the seal of the United States, shall be promulgated, and shall stand as fundamental constitutions between the thirteen original States, and those newly described, unalterable but by the joint consent of the United States in Congress assembled, and of the particular State within which such alteration is proposed to be made.

This paper is endorsed as follows, in a different hand-writing, supposed to be that of a clerk: "Report—Mr Jefferson. Mr. Chase, Mr. Howell."

WASHINGTON, February 20, 1849.

I certify that, at the request of my father, and with the permission of Mr. Buchanan, Secretary of State, the foregoing copy of "a plan for the temporary government of the Western Territory," was made by me from the original, deposited in the State Department among the archives of the Congress of the Confederation; and that I compared the copy with the original, with the assistance of Lund Washington, jr. Esq. and found it correct.

MORGAN DIX.

APPENDIX No. 2.

The following is the vote on the Anti-Slavery clause of Jefferson, above given, April 19, 1784:

New Hampshire	Mr. Foster	ay	ay
	Mr. Blanchard	ay	
Massachusetts	Mr. Gerry	ay	ay
	Mr. Patridge	ay	
Rhode Island	Mr. Ellery	ay	ay
	Mr. Howell	ay	
Connecticut	Mr. Sherman	ay	ay
	Mr. Wadsworth	ay	
New York	Mr. De Witt	ay	ay
	Mr. Paine	ay	
New Jersey	Mr. Dick	ay	ay
Pennsylvania	Mr. Mifflin	ay	ay
	Mr. Montgomery	ay	
	Mr. Hand	ay	
Maryland	Mr. McHenry	no	no
	Mr. Stone	no	
Virginia	Mr. Jefferson	ay	no
	Mr. Hardy	no	
	Mr. Mercer	no	
North Carolina	Mr. Williamson	ay	div
	Mr. Spaight	no	
South Carolina	Mr. Read	no	no
	Mr. Beresford	no	

[*Journals of Congress (Way & Gideon,) vol. 4, p. 373.*

The asterisk opposite the name of Mr. Dick, of New Jersey, indicates that the vote was not counted, as a State could not be represented by less than two members or delegates. See section 2, art. 5, of the Articles of Confederation.

APPENDIX No. 3.

The following is a copy of Mr. King's proposition:

"That there shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the States described in the resolve of Congress of the 23d of April, 1784, otherwise than in punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been personally guilty and that this regulation shall be an article of compact, and remain a fundamental principle of the constit

object misled others. It left General Cass lately with his heels in the air. And yet General Taylor found it in that very position and succeeded in sitting down in it.

We have said that the name of Mr. Clay comes up to the mind associated with the advancement of no great principles, of no interest that has bearings more general than a locality or a class. It is true that he was an advocate of emancipation in Kentucky half a century ago, and he tells us in his recent letter that his opinions have remained unchanged ever since. That fifty years have wrought no advancement or ripening of his ideas on this subject, does not tend to raise him in our minds as a statesman. But in truth his views of Slavery have never been those of a statesman, nor of a philanthropist. Statesmanlike they could not be, for they were limited by the supposed interests of a single class, and they have received no forward impulse and no expansion during the period of more than an entire generation, a generation which has accomplished more than any other in the propagation of social and humanitary science. Truly philanthropic they could not be, for they were smothered by the pressure of a merely physical majority.

The medical history of the human mind exhibits many instances of sufficiently ludicrous hallucinations. Men have fancied themselves to be teapots, junk bottles, and what not. Lord Timothy Dexter had a *penchant* for considering himself dead, and we have known those who took it for granted that they were alive with as little substantial foundation in fact. But we have never met with any vagary of mental assumption more preposterous than that Mr. Clay should suppose himself an Abolitionist.

His letter reminds one of Governor Panza's dinner in the island of Barataria. The preparations for the meal seem satisfactory enough, and we sit down expecting a substantial repast. But, one by one, the dishes are whisked away from us, and we are finally left to make such an arrangement with our importunate appetites as the assets left to us in the shape of knife, fork, and napkin will admit of.

We have no complaint to make of the three or four introductory paragraphs. Mr. Clay treats all the nonsense about the benefits of Slavery contemptuously enough. But he immediately proceeds to consider the question with sole reference to the presumed advantage of the white race. He takes the case out of the court of conscience where alone it can be decided absolutely and without appeal, and puts it at the mercy of the never-ending litigation of political economy. If there be no moral wrong in the robbery of one half of the community by the other half, the problem of the advantages of such a system would meet with a very different solution from each moiety respectively. But, if the system be wicked, and unprofitable because that is one necessary condition of wickedness, the chances of prolonged debate are greatly lessened.

Even after taking it for granted that emancipation is for the interest of Kentucky, Mr. Clay humbly concludes by saying that if the majority decide against him, he shall submit. The majority of the people of the United States has several times decided against Mr. Clay and yet he has shown no bashful reluctance to being again a candidate. "Pick your flint and try again," was his motto a few years ago. Is a question which concerns an entire race to be given up more readily than the shadow of a dream of a chance for the Presidency? If the majority be thus absolute in deciding what things are right and what wrong, what Office would insure the throats of the masters in any State where the slaves became numerically superior?

The truth is that Mr. Clay's letter is disgraceful to the community in which it is written. We admit that deliberation should characterise the movements of States, and such deliberation will necessarily, without any precaution of ours, characterise the movement of large masses of men living under a long established social system, provided they are begun early enough, and are made in accordance with the spirit of the age. For, example, if the slaves of Kentucky were liberated to-morrow and relieved from every political disability, the question of their position in the social order would settle itself by the slow and gradual operation of natural causes. A social wrong, based originally upon brute force, and perpetuated by it, may be reached and remedied by legislation, and the sooner the better. Why wait for the rust to eat handcuffs asunder, when there is a key ready to unlock them? We concede to Mr. Clay that deliberation should characterise Statesmen no less than States. The rudder which determines the direction of the intellectual or ethical advancement of any age may be behind it, as in a vessel. But the steersman at the wheel is in front, and with a clear outlook forward. Mr. Clay's notion of the duty of the man at the helm seems to be that he should be keeping his balance astride of an empty cask, out of sight, in the rear of the ship.

We shall not trouble ourselves with an analysis of a document which all our readers will probably read for themselves. The spirit of barbarism which distinguishes it, would alone be a sufficient argument in condemnation of a system which could so blunt the sensibilities of an originally fine nature, and obscure the perceptions of a keen and quick intellect.

The Letter is valuable chiefly as a curiosity and as a sign of the times. It is the unwilling creaking of a rusty political weathercock which begins to feel the first indications of wind from a new quarter. One thing is very certain. It is not of such material that reforms are made. Here is compromise outcompromised, and terms offered to the devil such as he would not have dared to ask. Here is wrong to be treated on the principle of *similia similibus curantur*, but with no homœopathic dose. The poor slave if he escape being sold out of the State, and if he survive the thirty-nine years administration of hairs of the dog that bit him prescribed by Mr. Clay, is to be transported to a fever manufactory at his own expense.

A man is drowning and Dr. Clay is called in. The following is his prescription:—"*Take of water (if distilled, the better) enough to submerge the patient. Keep him carefully sunk therein thirty nine hours, or more in proportion to the length of time he has already been under water. Then raise him carefully, attach a fifty-six pound weight to each ancle, transport him to the middle of the Atlantic ocean] (at his own expense) and there drop him overboard. I think he will never be liable to a recurrence of the complaint.*"—J. R. L.

Guadaloupe Petition to the President of the United States.

In a late number of the *Jamaica Journal* we find the following petition from the inhabitants of Guadaloupe to the President of the United States, which has not before come under our notice. What reception it met with on the part of the Executive Government, we do not know, but such an appeal could hardly fail to find favour with Mr. Polk. It does not appear even that the petitioners ever came to this country; we indeed think that they did not, from the remark of the *Journal*, that "the parties in question were fearful of the future, which has not proved so gloomy as they anticipated." They intended probably, or at least, would have liked to bring away the blacks with them as their slaves from Guadaloupe, and we cannot conceive of any other motive for the petition unless such was their intention. Perhaps, however, they meant only to appeal to the sympathies of the United States Government, and that they could not fail to receive. Slaveholders whom France had compelled to do justly by those whom they had so long robbed and oppressed, very naturally and properly would appeal for sympathy and aid either to Brazil or the United States—the only Governments of any consequence where that sort of tyranny is any longer tolerated.

The petition is as follows:

To his Excellency, the President of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, Washington.

Your Excellency—We, the undersigned, inhabitants of Guadaloupe, belonging to the white population, whose families had, even since 1793, emigrated to your shores,—we are French citizens, landholders and merchants, most of us having resided, been brought up, or educated amongst you, or traded with the Union, beg to crave your attention to the following subject.

Since the last French revolution, the Provisional Government having emancipated our slaves, without previously paying a just and equitable indemnity, which proceeding has thrown us into ruin, discouragement, and the greatest desolation, we have, in this predicament, cast our eyes towards your friendly nation, as being the only one whose sympathy to the French emigrants, in other times, has already been experienced.

From what is above stated, and the present situation of this island, we are all of opinion that it cannot longer afford shelter and security to the whites; nor do we even think we can remain in safety for the future, from what has already occurred in Martinico, and the bad disposition of the blacks here; it being proved by experience that, after ruin and misery, disturbance must follow. We, in consequence thereof, cannot refrain any longer from applying to your excellency, with a request that you will favour us with such facilities as would enable us to retire and settle in such part of the United States which you might deem convenient to grant us.

We indulge in the hope that the generous nation you are at the head of will make no difficulty against admitting us as brothers—for such we are, by the blood spilt by our fathers, when aiding with your ancestors in the glorious battles fought for independence, and for the defence of that soil, some small portion of which we now beg from you.

The American people and their Government, are already possessed with all your sympathies, and an aggregation to their population, we trust, will be no incumbrance to the public welfare.

We remain, with deep respect, your excellency's very humble and obedient servants.

[Signatures follow.]

Point à Pete, Guadaloupe, August, 22, 1848.

Two slaves were brought about a week since in a vessel from Virginia to this city. The vessel lay near the foot of Canal street for several days, and when it became known that slaves were on board, a number of the Abolitionists proffered to aid them in gaining their liberty.—The slaves were grateful for the interest taken in them, but refused to accept the offers. When the vessel left for Virginia, they returned in her to their master, whom they loved.

"*Whom they loved!*" It is the *Sun* (Old Hunker) which is thus pathetic. It is true, however, that a Virginia vessel, lying in one of the city docks, a few days since, was found to have on board two slaves, who were told, by a coloured man who doesn't believe in the *Sun's* philosophy, that Slavery is better than Freedom, that, if they chose, they could declare themselves freemen, and be successfully defended in their rights. They preferred to return to their masters, not because of any special love towards them, but because one of them was to become free at home, on his return, and the other had almost completed the purchase of his freedom, and preferred to return to his wife and children, who were already free. Actually they returned to Virginia, not because they loved to be slaves, but because they loved wife and children, parents and home. There are more things in Heaven and earth than are dreamt of in the *Sun's* democracy.

Fugitives in Ohio.

If the South had ever carried out a tithe of the threats she has made against the North, there would long ago have been a vacuum from Mason and Dixon's line to Canada. The entire Yankee Nation would have been sunk "deeper than plummet soundeth," or blown up into imponderable atoms, by gubernatorial messages, legislative resolutions, and editorial fulminations, if the destructive power of such artillery depended upon the loudness of its explosion. But Cape Cod sticks out into the sea as impudent as ever, notwithstanding South Carolina, and Sandy Hook is still above water in spite of the tremendous denunciations, from time to time, of the Chivalry of Virginia.

This latter State has begun now upon the Ohio river, which is confidently expected, in accordance with a series of Resolutions which are daily looked for from the Virgininia Legislature, to overflow the State of Ohio, and joining the Lakes on the North, to wash it out from the face of the earth. It seems that some three years ago a Virginian, who was not so much fallen, as he was born among thieves, and who had been robbed, all his life long, of his wages, by one Samuel B. Brown, of Augusta Co., chose to seek a new home and an honest people in the State of Ohio. As Brown claimed the flesh and bones and blood of this poor man, he claimed also the clothes that covered him, and very likely some other things which the poor fellow saw fit to take as a reminder, more than in payment, of a score or two of years of work without wages. Thereupon the Governor of Virginia demanded the fugitive from the Governor of Ohio, as a thief, which demand the latter dignitary declined to gratify. The refusal was put upon the same ground that it has been in similar cases in other States,—viz. a want of evidence that the person claimed had stolen anything. A second requisition was made, and again refused. when the following tremendous message was issued, the result of which Ohio awaits in fear and trembling:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, March 9, 1849

To the Speaker of the House of Delegates:

SIR—On the 3d January, 1849, I made a requisition upon the Governor of the State of Ohio, for the delivery of a fugitive from justice, called Joseph Venable, and described as a negro man slave, the property of Samuel B. Brown. This requisition was contemptuously refused, upon the ground of the affidavit. To obviate all difficulty, I made a second requisition for the same offender on the 3d day of February. This requisition, like the first, was also refused, and in a manner not less discourteous. For the manner in which the demands have been met, I refer to documents herewith enclosed for the consideration of the Legislature. It will be seen, by reference to the reasons assigned in the memorandum attached to the last requisition, that the authorities of the State of Ohio virtually refuse to recognise the validity of the laws of this Commonwealth regulating the proceedings against slaves for criminal offences; thus constituting the broad ægis of a sister republic, which was intended to be the guaranty of protection from wrong, the strong-hold of fugitives from justice, and harbour of safety for felons escaping the penalties of the law. I do not doubt but there are many right minded and patriotic citizens in the State of Ohio, whose patriotism and sense of justice will condemn in the strongest manner the fanatical spirit of aggression on the constitutional rights of the Southern States. I can but hope that their better judgments and more patriotic counsels will in time prevail to save our country from the ruin and disruption to which the contrary course will inevitably lead. In the mean time, I feel bound to call the attention of the Legislature to the transaction, with a hope that their wisdom will devise some means of preventing similar occurrences in future.

Very respectfully, your ob't servant,

JOHN B. FLOYD.

KENTUCKY MOVING.—A Convention of the friends of Emancipation in Kentucky is to be held at Frankfort on the 25th of April. The *Examiner* urges the holding of local meetings for the choice of delegates, and calls for a rally from all parts of the State. The attention of the people is thoroughly aroused to the subject, and Kentucky will take her place among the Free States, long before, according to Mr. Clay's plan, Emancipation should be commenced.

☞ We call attention to the able speech of Mr. Dix, with which we occupy a large portion of this number of the *Standard*. Though delivered several weeks since, it has only recently been published, from the honourable Senator's own notes. It sets forth in its proper light the scheme of Walker and his fellow doe-faces, and gives an interesting sketch of the early action of the United States Government on the subject of Slavery.

Scene in a Republic.

Jerrold's (London) *News*—a paper, by-the-bye, from which, as the "constant reader" must observe, we often quote, and which we hold to be the most valuable weekly sheet in her majesty's dominions—notices a new work, just published in London, entitled the Western World, or "Travels in the United States in 1846-7, by A. Mackay, Esq. Barrister-at-law." It is a "worthy book" says the *News*, "full of sober sense, and plain rational description." It quotes a passage which we copy; and a pretty story it is, too, for a London barrister to go home and tell of the "Model Republic!"

"At one end of the car in which I was seated sat a young man, very respectably dressed, but who bore in his countenance those traces, almost indelible, which, long after every symptom of the colour has vanished, bespeak the presence of African blood in the veins. The quantity which he possessed could not have been more than 12 1 2 per cent. of his whole blood, tinging his skin with a shade, just visible, and no more. If his face was not as white, it was, at all events, cleaner than those of many around him. I observed that he became very uneasy every time the conductor came into the car, eyeing him with timid glances, as if in fear of him. Divining the cause of this conduct, I determined to watch the issue which was not long delayed. By-and-by the conducto entered the car again, and as if he had come for the purpose, walked straight up to the poor wretch in question and, without deigning to speak to him, ordered him ou with a wave of his finger. The blood in a moment mounted to his temples, and suffused his whole face; but resistance was vain; and with a hanging head and broken hearted look he left the carriage. He was not a slave; but not a soul remonstrated, not a whisper was heard in his behalf. The silence of all indicated their approval of this petty manifestation of the tyranny of blood. These bold defenders of 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,' these chivalrous asserters of the Declaration of Independence, looked with utter indifference on this practical violation of the 'rights of man.'

"'Served the d—d nigger right,' said a youngster scarcely twenty, at the other end of the car, and those immediately around him laughed at the remark.

"'He'll know his place better the next time, the b—y mongrel!' said another; and the laugh was repeated.

"Curious to know what had been done with him, I sought the conductor, whom I found returning from the front part of the train.

"'Blow me,' said he 'if you can't reg'late a thousand of your out-and-out onpretendin' niggers much more easier than one of these composition gentry; they think because they have got a little whitewash on their ugly mugs, that they're the real china, and no mistake.'

"'But where have you put him?' I asked; 'he surely can't ride on the engine?'

"'Put him?—in the nigger crib, to be sure, where he should be,' said he.

"'Can I see it?' I inquired.

"'You can, if you have a taste that way,' he replied; 'keep on ahead, straight through the baggage van, and you'll see them all alive.'"

The Southern Press.

We have devoted a large portion of our paper recently to articles from Southern newspapers, to show the spirit of the South so far as it can be learned, from the press and public meetings, on the question of Disunion. Until this week the extracts have been mainly confined to the Disunion side of the question, which, we are sorry to say, are by far the smaller in number; though were we to judge by the number of public meetings, and the character of the Resolutions passed at them, the conclusion would inevitably be that the South was determined to dissolve the Union. But those who are resolved to maintain the Union hold no meetings, and they are, if we may judge from the large number of papers maintaining that view, in a large majority.

It is to another feature of the Southern Press to which we sometimes call attention, and which an extract or two has turned our own at this moment. There is nothing like it now in the literature of any other country; there never has been, and, in fact, never could be, for the energy and enterprise of the American character was needed to give to such a trade, as it chronicles the activity with which it flourishes at the South. We copy these extracts. The first is from the *Alabama Argus*, published at Dayton, Alabama, and is as follows:

FOR SALE

60 NEGROES!!

By order of the Hon. the Orphans' Court of Marengo County, the undersigned, administrator of the estate of Moses W. Alexander, deceased, will, on Monday, the 5th of February, 1849, at the plantation of said Moses W. Alexander, deceased, in the Cane Brake, one mile south of Col. Pickens' mills, offer at public sale, to the highest bidder, a lot, numbering sixty, of the likeliest and best negroes ever sold in the South. They are all family negroes—not bought up by speculators from every State in the South, but raised by different men, in families from five to twenty each. Among this stock of negroes, are some able bodied, stout, and valuable negro men, and several likely young boys, from ten to eighteen years of age, also some likely negro women, girls and children. Among the same A number 1, Cotton pickers. A good weaver and also one negro who is a very good Carpenter and Blacksmith. Terms of sale—twelve months credit, with approved security.

J. M. ALEXANDER, *Adm'r.*

Jan. 5.

The next is from a paper published at Opelousas, La. This, as well as that which we have just copied, should be especially interesting to Northern mechanics:

AUCTION SALE.

The undersigned will offer for sale through the ministry of a Public Auctioneer, on her plantation near Carancro, in the Paris of St. Landry,

On Monday, the 5th day of February next, and the following days:

100 CHOICE SLAVES,

of both sexes and different ages; among which is a good Blacksmith and several other mechanics. These slaves will be sold separately and under full and *satisfactory guarantee of titles.*

8 Ox Carts, 69 work Oxen, 20 Mules, 20 work Horses, 1,500 barrels of Corn, 12,500 Cypress Pickets.

CONDITIONS OF SALE.

The slaves will be sold on a credit of one and two years from the day of sale, purchasers giving sufficient security to the satisfaction of the vendor, and the slaves remaining specially mortgaged until final payment of principal and the interest which may accrue thereon, at the rate of eight per cent per annum from time due until final payment.

The conditions of the sale of the moveable property will be made known on the day of sale.

WIDOW HYPOLITE CRETIEN.

Opelousas, January 3d, 1849.

We wonder if the Widow Hypolite Cretien ever heard of the justice in Vermont who demanded that a slave-claimant should bring him a title deed from God Almighty before he would acknowledge that a man could be delivered up as property to his fellow-man. Probably Mrs. Cretien never thought of that, and very likely would be shocked at the Vermonter's impiety.

Another good woman, in New Orleans, thus disposes of a young girl in her family. Madame Riquerand italicises her advertisement, as an emphatic testimony to the skill of the young seamstress.

SERVANT FOR SALE.

A girl about 18 years of age, *a first rate Seamstress* and house girl. Apply to

MADAME RIQUERAND.

Mr. Banister in New Orleans also advertises one of the can't-take-care-of-themselves, thus:

FOR SALE.

A CREOLE SLAVE, 38 years of age. He is a first rate Cooper, and guarantied as such. Inquire at N. 5, Bienville street. C. BANISTER.

We have room for another only from a New Orleans paper. We offer it to some of our city papers as a proof of how well the slaves are treated. They are fatted up here for sale:

SLAVE DEPOT.

J. BUDDY.

☞ Slave Yard and Boarding-House, 159 Gravier street, second door from Carondelet.

HOUSE SERVANTS and FIELD HANDS for sale at all times. Slaves will be received on board or sold on favourable terms. The building is a large, three story brick house, and very commodious as a Slave Depot. Particular attention will be paid to the health and cleanliness of all slaves placed in this Yard.

THE PENNSYLVANIA FREEMAN mentions a recent case in Baltimore, where a woman, who had lived as a free woman for eighteen years, having been emancipated by her master, was seized, with her eight children, and all dragged off as slaves by a son of her former owner. Such a proceeding is entirely in accordance with slaveholding law, if the woman could show no deed of manumission. In that case she and her children after her, to the latest generation, are chattel slaves.

HON. WM. H. SEWARD.—On the nomination of Mr. Collamer, of Vermont, as Postmaster General, objection was made to him in the Senate, according to the correspondent of the *Evening Post*, because of his free-soilism; to which the singularly honest reply was made by some Southern Senators, that he was no more of a free-soiler than it was necessary for a Vermont politician to be!—a palliation equally complimentary to Mr. Collamer, and indicative of the standard of American politics. We learn, however, from the letter of the able correspondent of the *Post*, in which we find this fact stated, that during its discussion a declaration was made by Mr. Seward, who has taken his seat as a Senator from this State, which would not have surprised us a year or two ago, but which we hardly expected in view of the important part he acted in the election of Gen. Taylor. "For his part," he said, "he might be held to represent the most radical opinions upon Slavery that were upheld by any considerable body of the people of the North. He noticed the objection that had been made to the confirmation of the Taylor Postmaster General, and contented himself with saying, that he should suppose that Mr. Collamer would substantially agree with him. But it was time there should be an understanding. He would, therefore, simply defy them to make this issue, to vote against his man upon this ground, and establish this principle. He had nothing more to say at this time, and he took his seat, *sub silentio*." "There was a sensation," continues the writer, "and after he had settled himself back in his leathern cushions, there was a general buzz. I was told that old Bullion laughed quite heartily at the visible distress depicted on the countenance of some of the warmest Whig supporters of General Taylor."

If Mr. Seward's Whig friends believe him sincere in this declaration of independence they might well look distressed. The Taylor dynasty will bear no such defiant supporters as this.

☞ The *Liberator* of last week publishes the following Remonstrance from Scotland, received from William Smeal of Glasgow. It was committed to Mr. Smeal's care, says the *Liberator*, "by that eloquent and intrepid friend of humanity, GEORGE JEFFREY, United Presbyterian minister. It is written on parchment, and with the signatures makes a pretty long roll. Grateful for this timely co-operation and valuable testimony, we assure our friend and the signers, that the best possible use shall be made of it."

Another Scottish Remonstrance.

We, the undersigned, inhabitants of the Ythan district of Buchan, Aberdeenshire, and members of the Anti Slavery Society, do respectfully but earnestly remonstrate with the American Churches, about the countenance which they give to American Slavery. Our common humanity cries out against the sin of depriving men of their natural rights, and of making them the property of other men, to be used and sold at pleasure; and our common Christianity is still more urgent in its condemnation of such an enormity. We then regret, exceedingly, that in your religious societies, which profess to care for the best interests of humanity, and to spread the principles of Christianity, there should be any toleration afforded to a system which outrages both of them.

If Slavery were exclusively a political question, your churches would be justified in any neutrality of conduct which they might observe towards it; but as it is plainly a question with which are bound up all the concerns of personal freedom and social morality, we cannot but grieve that your churches should have taken up, and in spite of innumerable remonstrances from their Christian brethren all over this country, should have maintained a position, which is more favourable to the oppressors than to the oppressed.

Be your intentions and sympathies what they may, you practically give full indulgence to the slaveholders; and so far as we can see, you consecrate, in the name of the Divine Redeemer and Lord of all men, the tyrannical and cruel relations in which they stand to the injured slaves. You virtually sanction the heavy yoke which no man, much less a Christian man, is warranted to bind upon another.

If Slavery be so closely incorporated with your civil institutions as to be difficult of extinction, we cannot imagine how it ever should have introduced itself so much into your religious organisations, as that it may not now be repudiated by these. We beseech you so separate, forthwith, American Christianity from American Slavery. The alliance has fostered the latter, but weakened the former, a result which we are sure you do not contemplate with satisfaction, or with any other feelings save those of self-reproach.

Praying fervently to God for the prosperity of your churches, we have thus also, from a conviction of duty, remonstrated with you concerning an evil which, so long as it exists, will mar, in a thousand ways, all spiritual prosperity. We address you as brethren, and hope soon to have the delight of witnessing you acting as the brethren of those who are now degraded slaves.

JOHN MARTIN, President,
JAMES BREBNER, Vice President,
JAMES MORISON, Treasurer,
WILLIAM MOIR, Clerk,

And ONE THOUSAND AND FORTY others, nine of whom are ministers of various denominations.

☞ Editors of religious journals in the United States are respectfully requested to give this Christian Remonstrance an insertion in their columns, and also all Anti-Slavery editors.

CONGRESS.—The called session of the Senate is still sitting at Washington. The greater portion of its time has been spent in debating the case of Gen. Shields, of Illinois, which was finally settled by the passage of the following Resolution offered by Mr. Calhoun:

Resolved, That the election of James Shields to be a Senator of the United States was void, he not having been as a qualification to be a Senator of the United States at the commencement of the term for which he was elected.

☞ JOHN A. COLLINS, we learn from an exchange paper, is about to go to California to organise the Sons of Temperance in that country. Mr. Collins has been, for some time past, the editor of the *Queen City*, a temperance paper, published in Cincinnati.

To Correspondents.

E. L. F. will receive an explanation by letter.

F. W. B. His paper was stopped—we do not remember by whose order, but probably by that of the Postmaster, as the subscription does not expire for about three months.

J. C. H.—M. B's was sent till the Postmaster reported it "not called for," and requested that it should be stopped.

Domestic Correspondence.

Self government.

To Beriah Green, of Utica, N. Y

SIR:—Since the publication of my letter of the 22nd of February, addressed to yourself, concerning government, I have read number nine of a series of articles on the same subject from "*The Misanthrope*," in the *Model Worker* of the 9th instant. That article, I presume, was written by you, and on the face of it appears to meet my own arguments so admirably, without directly replying to the same, that I cannot suffer it to pass without making some comments thereupon, and without improving the opportunity afforded by its publication, of still further impressing upon the minds of our readers, the paramount importance of the extension of the law-making power, (with all its prerogatives and responsibilities, in its various departments of the preparation, adoption and execution of laws)—"irrespective of sex, colour or character"—as presenting the *only* feasible means of enabling man to "put himself into harmony with the laws of his existence," that thus, governing himself legitimately, he may be qualified to govern his fellow men by the exercise of that "authority which is (*only*) the natural and inevitable influence of superior wisdom and moral power."

At the outset, let me say, that the question is not one of fact, as to what or who *actually* governs man. Injustice has got into the world, somehow. In spiteof all that superior wisdom and moral power could do to prevent it, or aided by them. If against their utmost preventive efforts, then the abolition of injustice demands the exercise of *all* the superior wisdom and moral power of *all* the men, women and children there is in the world, and a very large *increase*, besides, or rather a fuller and more complete *exhibition* thereof, by a higher and more perfect development of their capacities therefor. There is none so wise or good, that he cannot err and sin. There is none so foolish or wicked, that he cannot perform a wise and virtuous act. Naturally, I mean. "Equal rights to equal chances," is clearly the natural law, in this case. And as for the other, if on the contrary, the injustice in the world is the result of superior intellectual and moral exertion, a *just* civil government is an impossibility Humanity is doomed "to be, to do and to suffer "*unjustly* to the end of time. God wills it. God thus reveals himself, in his modes of action, an *omniscient and an omnipotent creator of evil. Apollyon* rules. The conclusion is inevitable, if the premises are sound; but the premises are not sound. Rather believe that there is inhering in the substance of all things such a tendency to *growth* in wisdom and goodness, that finally, through long and bitter experience of the violation of the laws of their existence, men will discover what these laws are, and cheerfully, voluntarily conform to them, and by thus conforming, bring to a speedy end the reign of falsehood and tyranny, "establish justice, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and to their posterity "forevermore. For herein is the radical defect of human nature, (if it be a defect,) that in the beginning it is necessarily ignorant of all law, as the warning voice within must needs be *confirmed* by the actual trial of somebody or other of the beneficial or injurious consequences resulting from the pursuit of this or that course of action. And in this view, your *innocence*, is not so good a qualification for the office of governor, or teacher, of your fellow-men, as my *guilt*. Jesus of Nazareth, came hither to call; not the righteous, but *sinners*, to repentance. But "there is none that doeth good"—all, all have sinned. And if it be the duty of sinners to "repent, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance," it is their right; for identity of duties implies equality of rights, if an equality of rights, does not invariably imply identity of duties. All human beings have an equal right to be happy—each in his or her own way—according to the diversity of the distribution of human endowment. It does not follow, however, that it is the duty of the man to suckle the children of the woman, his wife; she alone is physically capable of that. But in the matter of daily labour, thought, advice and suffrage, both men and women stand upon the same platform.—Equally capable, more or less, physically, intellectually and morally of the performance of these duties, their rights must be identically the same. So of every variety of character among men and women. Capacities, in kind being the same, duties and rights are necessarily equal.

No, no. The *actual* government of what is called society up to this writing, has been usurped and administered by sheer ignorance and brute force. Knowledge and brotherly love have been, as yet, invariably found opposed thereto, and they have been, from time immemorial, invariably denounced and prosecuted as rebellious and traitor.

On Tuesday morning, 13th inst. at his residence at Bloomingdale, JOHN H. HOWLAND, of this city, in the 76th year of his age.

On the evening of the 13th inst. CAROLINE AUGUSTA, wife of Andrew H. Mickle.

Suddenly on the 15th inst. at the residence of his father, in Brooklyn, WILLIAM MINOTT MITCHELL, Counsellor at law, in the 38th year of his age.

In Ithaca, N. Y. March 11, Hon. TIMOTHY S. WILLIAMS, Senator from the 26th district of this State.

In North Andover, Mass. March 4, Mrs. ELLEN MARIA LORING, daughter of Hon. Daniel P. King. 24.

In Dedham, Mass. March 10, MORTON, son of Edmund and Lucilla Pinckney Quincy, 3 years 9 months.

In New Orleans, La. lately, ANTOINETTE MAXEN, a coloured woman, 135. She was a native of Louisiana, and had enjoyed uninterrupted good health until a short time before her death.

On the 27th ult. at New Ross, (Ireland,) in the 78th year of his age, the Rev. GEORGE WHITMORE CARR, well known as the founder of the first temperance society in Europe.

Acknowledgments.

For the Standard, from Feb. 22, to March. 20th, 1849.

484	Nancy Hildreth, Manchester, Mass.	$1 00
492	J. W. Pound, Lockport, N. Y.	2 00
491	C. Squires, Lockport, N. Y.	2 00
485	W. B. Greene, Brookfield. Mass.	2 00
468	Edward Everetts, Cambridge, Mass.	2 66
520	C. Sedgwick, Lenox, Mass.	5 00
488	T. Marcy, Nantucket, Mass.	2 00
487	Hiram Putnam, Syracuse, N. Y.	2 00
490	Sydney Smith, Borodino, N. Y.	2 00
451	J. D. Spofford, Brocket's Bridge, N. Y.	50
450	Joseph Hewett. Brocket's Bridge, N. Y.	50
472	D. P. Livemore, Stafford, Ct.	2 00
484	M. H. Weiss, Worcester, Mass.	2 00
469	Lewis Ferris, Five Corners, N. Y.	1 00
511	Origen Steere, South Foster, R. I.	2 00
493	M. M. Davis, Bemis Heights, N. Y.	2 00
468	J. Johnson, Boston, Mass.	3 00
474	F. Williams, Roxbury, Mass.	2 00
470	Ana Pomeroy, Cambridge, Mass.	2 00
460	C. Francis, Cambridge, Mass.	2 50
496	P. Davis, East Bethel, Vt.	2 00
546	Edmund Jackson, Boston, Mass.	2 96
468	Samuel Hall, Jr. Boston, Mass.	2 00
472	E. Howe, Cambridge, Mass.	2 00
457	Samuel Stone, Binghampton, N. Y.	50
500	T. E. Lloyd, Fulton, N. Y.	2 00
472	Hannah Ripley, Hingham, Mass.	2 00
499	Daniel Sawyer, Weare, N. H.	2 00
470	G. H. Folger, Nantucket. Mass.	4 00
468	C. F. Winslow, Nantucket, Mass.	2 00
502	O. B. Marsh, New Milford, Ct.	2 00
472	N. Milliken, Lexington, Mass.	4 00
454	D. Hall, Westfield, N. Y.	1 00
483	Reuben Burrell, N. Y. city.	1 00
508	E. Buckingham, Trenton, N. Y.	2 00
455	S. J. Mapps, Trenton, N. Y.	37½
492	J. V. Laing, Rochester, N. Y.	2 00
454	James S. Douglass, Mexico, N. Y.	25
469	B. Joy, Ludlowville, N. Y.	1 00
503	J. M. Fiske. West Brookfield, Mass.	2 00
511	John Russ, Methuen, Mass.	2 00
485	S. Hood, Georgetown, Mass.	1 00
488	W. Delano, Fair Haven, Mass.	2 80
468	G. R. Russell, West Roxbury, Mass.	2 56
488	R. G. Shaw, Jr. Boston, Mass.	4 00
470	Susan C. Cabott, Cambridge, Mass.	2 75
479	N. Soule, Duxbury, Mass.	2 00
468	S. Mitchell, Nantucket, Mass.	2 66
506	A. D. Bright, Denmark, N. Y.	2 00
487	K. Dinwidie, Caledonia, N. Y.	2 00
478	N. Marble, Port Byron, N. Y.	2 00
458	N. Sisson, Collins, N. Y.	1 00
469	S. Bowen, Thompson, Ct.	2 00
463	A. Fuller, West Sumner, Me.	1 00
468	Wm. Hadwin, Nantucket, Mass.	4 00
457	J. Marsh, Victor, N. Y.	1 00
488	George G. Folger, Nantucket, Mass.	4 00
495	Peter Brown, N. Y. city.	2 00
		$120 01½

☞ NOTICE.—By the post office law now in force, publishers of newspapers are permitted to send, in their papers to subscribers, bills *unreceipted*; but a *receipted* bill subjects the receiver to letter postage. Our subscribers, therefore, will find a bill, unreceipted of course, in the papers at the expiration of the time to which they have paid. The amount received for subscription is acknowledged above, and the *whole* number to which the subscriber has paid preceding his name.

FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer.

RECEIPTS OF THE NEW YORK STATE VIGILANCE COMMITTEE FROM JANUARY 1, TO MARCH 15, 1849.

New York City. A. Lester, $20,00; L. Tappan, 5 00; W. E. Whiting, 5,00; A. Lane, 5,00; S. Leeds, 5,00; W. A. Hall, 5,00; K. G. Williams, 5,00; G. Whipple, 2 00; J. C. Gray, 3,00; D. S. Williams, 2,50; W. H. Pillow, 2,50; S. Smith, 2,00; J. R. Remy, 2,00; C. S. Sperry, 1,00.

Brooklyn, N. Y. H. W. Beecher, 5,00.
Flushing, N. Y. R. B. Parsons, 1,00.
Clinton, Conn. S. Higgins, 5,00.
Pomfret, Conn. Edward Lyon, 50,00.
New Bedford, Mass. Wm. Rotch, 30,00; Elizabeth Rodman, 20,00.

Total, $177 00.

WM. HARNED, *Treasurer*,
61 John Street.

March 19, 1849.

Notices.

WORCESTER COUNTY, SOUTH.

A Quarterly Meeting of the Worcester co South Division Anti-Slavery Society will be held at Worcester, in Brinley Hall, commencing on Saturday evening, March 24, and continuing on Sunday, day and evening.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, WENDELL PHILLIPS, PARKER PILLSBURY, SAMUEL MAY, Jr. W. W. BROWN, WM. and ELLEN CRAFT, the recently escaped "*property*" from Georgia, and other advocates of the cause, will attend.

Members of the Society are notified, and all others, are invited to be present.

JOHN C. WYMAN, *Rec. Sec.*

General Intelligence.

Appointments by the President.

Henry V. Brown has been nominated as Register of the Land Office at Green Bay, Wisconsin, *vice* G. S. Fisk, removed.

John Gayle, of Alabama, to be Judge of the District Court of the United States, for the northern and southern districts of Alabama, in the place of William Crawford deceased.

Archibald Williams, of Illinois, to be Attorney of the United States for the district of Illinois, in the place of David L. Gregg, whose commission is about to expire.

Palmer V. Kellogg, of New York, to be Marshal of the United States for the northern district of New York, in the place of Jacob Gould, whose commission is about to expire.

John Fettes, of Vermont, to be Marshal of the United States for the district of Vermont, in the place of Jacob Kent, whose commission is about to expire.

Samuel D. King and William Thompson, of Washington, to be Justices of the Peace for the county of Washington, in the District of Columbia.

Collectors of the Customs—Joseph T. Nye, Saco, Maine, vice Ichabod Jordan, whose commission expired.

Thomas Hedge, Plymouth, Massachusetts, vice Wm. Morton Jackson, whose commission expired.

James Donaghe, New Haven, Connecticut, vice Norris Wilcox, whose commission expired.

Naval Officer—Charles Hudson, Boston, Massachusetts, vice Wm. Parmenter, whose commission expired.

Surveyors of the Customs—George Howland, Tiverton R. I., vice Asa Gray, whose commission expired.

Wm. P. Greene, Providence, R. I., vice D. F. Seamans, whose commission expired.

George Evans, Caleb B. Smith, and R. T. Payne, Commissioners on Mexican Claims.

W. C. Jones, Secretary to Mexican Commissioners.

Seaton Gales, Secretary to Berlin Legation.

John Shelbey, Postmaster, Nashville, Tenn.

W. H. Leroy, Navy Agent, New York.

E. Rose, Collector. Sag Harbour.

James Collier, Collector, San Francisco.

W. B. Norris, Surveyor, Philadelphia.

J. H. Rhea, Collector, Brazos Santiago.

J. C. Campbell, Chief Justice, Western District of Louisiana.

Boyce, Attorney, Eastern District Louisiana.

King, Marshal, Eastern District Louisiana.

W. D Scott, Marshal, Eastern District of Louisiana.

Thomas C. Perkins, District Attorney

Poetry.

BINGEN.

BY THE HON. MRS. NORTON.

A soldier of the Legion, lay dying in Algiers
There was lack of woman's nursing, there was dearth of woman's tears.
But a comrade stood before him, while his life blood ebbed away,
And bent, with pitying glances, to hear what he might say.
The dying soldier faltered, as he took that comrade's hand,
And he said, "I never more shall see, my own, my native land;
Take a message, and a token, to same distant friends of mine,
For I was born at Bingen,—at Bingen on the Rhine.
Tell my brothers and companions, when they meet and crowd around,
To hear my mournful story, in the pleasant vineyard ground,
That we fought the battle bravely,—and when the day was done,
Full many a corse lay ghastly pale, beneath the setting sun
And midst the dead and dying were some grown old in wars,—
The death wound on their gallant breasts the last of many scars;
But some were young, and suddenly beheld life's morn decline,—
And had come from Bingen,—fair Bingen on the Rhine!
Tell my Mother, that her other sons shall comfort her old age,
And I was still a tenant bird, that thought his home a cage;
For my father was a soldier, and even as a child,
My heart leaped forth to hear him tell of struggles fierce and wild;
And when he died, and left us to divide his scanty hoard,
I let them take whate'er they would—but kept my father's sword;
And with boyish love I hung it where the bright light used to shine
On the cottage wall at Bingen—calm Bingen on the Rhine.
Tell my sister not to weep for me, and sob with drooping head,
When the troops are marching home again, with glad and gallant tread,
But to look upon them proudly, with a calm and steadfast eye,
For her brother was a soldier too, and not afraid to die.
And if a comrade seek her love, I ask her in my name,
To listen to him kindly without regret or shame;
And to hang the old sword in its place, (my father's sword and mine,)
For the honour of old Bingen, dear Bingen on the Rhine!
There's another—not a sister;—in the happy days gone by,
You'd have known her by the merriment that sparkled in her eye;
Too innocent for coquetry—too fond for idle scorning,
Oh! friend I fear the brightest heart makes sometimes heaviest mourning,—
Tell her the last night of my life—(for ere this moon be risen,
My body will be out of pain, my soul be out of prison,)
I dreamed I stood with *her*, and saw the yellow sun-light shine,
On the vine-clad hills of Bingen,—fair Bingen on the Rhine!
I saw the blue Rhine sweep along—I heard or seemed to hear,
The German songs we used to sing, in chorus sweet and clear;
And down the pleasant river, and up the slanting hill,
The echoing chorus sounded, through the evening calm and still;
And her glad blue eyes were on me, as we passed with friendly talk,
Down many a path beloved of yore, and well remembered walk;
And her little hand lay lightly, confidingly in mine,—
But we'll meet no more at Bingen,—loved Bingen on the Rhine!"
His voice grew faint and hoarser,—his grasp was childish weak,—
His eyes put on a dying look,—he sighed and ceased to speak:
His comrade bent to lift him, but the spark of life had fled;
The soldier of the Legion in a foreign land was dead!
And the soft moon rose up slowly, and calmly she looked down,
On the red sand of the battle-field, with bloody corpses strewn;
Yea, calmly on that dreadful scene, her pale light seemed to shine,
As once on distant Bingen,—fair Bingen on the Rhine!

From the Dublin University Magazine

SUMMER LONGINGS.

Las Mananas Horidas
De Abril y Mayo.—CALDERON.

Ah! my heart is ever waiting—
Waiting for the May—
Waiting for the pleasant rambles,
Where the fragrant hawthorn brambles,
With the woodbine alternating,
Scent the dewy way.
Ah! my heart is weary waiting—
Waiting for the May.

Ah! my heart is sick with longing,
Longing for the May—
Longing to escape from study,
To the young face fair and ruddy,
And the thousand charms belonging
To the Summer's day.
Ah! my heart is sick with longing,
Longing for the May.

Ah! my heart is sore with sighing,
Sighing for the May—
Sighing for the sure returning,
When the Summer beams are burning,
Hopes and flowers that dead or dying,
All the winter lay.
Ah! my heart is sore with sighing,
Sighing for the May.

Ah! my heart is pained with throbbing,
Throbbing for the May—
Throbbing for the sea-side billows,
Or the water-wooing willows;
Where in laughing and in sobbing
Glide the streams away.
Ah! my heart is sick with throbbing,
Throbbing for the May.

Waiting, sad, dejected, weary,
Waiting for the May,
Spring goes by with wasted warnings—
Moon lit evenings, sun-bright mornings—
Summer comes, yet dark and dreary
Life still ebbs away—
Man is ever weary, weary
Waiting for the May!

D. F. M. C.

THE BREVITY OF LIFE.

Behold
How short a span
Was long enough of old
To measure out the life of man;
In those well-tempered days, his time was then
Surveyed, cast up, and found but threescore years and ten.

Alas,
And what is that!
They come, and slide, and pass
Before my pen can tell thee what:
The posts of time are swift, which, having run
Their seven short stages o'er, their short-lived task is done.

Our days
Begun, we lend
To sleep, to antic plays
And toys, until the first stage-end;
Twelve waning moons, twice five times told, we give
To unrecovered loss; we rather breathe than live.

We spend
A ten year's breath
Before we apprehend
What 'tis to live, or fear a death;
Our childish dreams are filled with painted joys,
Which please our sense a while, and waking, prove but toys.

How vain,
How wretched is
Poor man, that doth remain
A slave to such a state as this!
His days are short at longest, few at most;
They are but bad at best, yet lavished out or lost.

They be
The secret springs
That make our minutes flee
On wheels more swift than eagle's wings;
Our life's a clock, and every grasp of breath
Breathes forth a warning voice, till Time shall strike a death.

How soon
Our new-born light
Attains to full-aged noon!
And this, how soon to gray-haired night!
We spring, we bud, we blossom, and we blast,
Ere we can count our days, our days they flee so fast.

They end
When scarce begun;
And ere we apprehend
That we begin to live, our life is done:
Man count thy days, and if they fly too fast
For thy dull thoughts to count, *count every day thy last.*

HERBERT.

Miscellany.

THE JESUITS.

BY T. B. MACAULAY.

As each of the two parties at the court of James had the support of foreign princes, so each had also the support of an ecclesiastical authority to which the king paid great deference. The supreme pontiff was for legal and moderate courses, and his sentiments were expressed by the nuncio and by the vicar apostolic. On the other side was a body of which the weight balanced even the weight of the papacy, the mighty order of Jesus.

That at this conjuncture these two great spiritual powers, once, as it seemed, inseparably allied, should have been opposed to each other, is a most important and remarkable circumstance. During a period of little less than a thousand years the regular orders had been the chief support of the Holy See. By that See they had been protected from episcopal interference; and the protection which they received had been amply repaid. But for their exertions it is probable that the Bishop of Rome would have been merely the honorary president of a vast aristocracy of prelates. It was by the aid of the Benedictines that Gregory the Seventh was enabled to contend at once against the Franconian Cæsars and against the secular clergy. It was by the aid of the Dominicans and Franciscans that Innocent the Third crushed the Albigensian sectaries. In the sixteenth century, the pontificate, exposed to new dangers more formidable than had ever before threatened it, was saved by a new religious order, which was animated by intense enthusiasm and organized with exquisite skill. When the Jesuits came to the rescue of the papacy, they found it in extreme peril, but from that moment the tide of battle turned. Protestantism, which had, during a whole generation, carried all before it, was stopped in its progress, and rapidly beaten back from the foot of the Alps to the shores of the Baltic. Before the order had existed a hundred years, it had filled the whole world with memorials of great things done and suffered for the faith. No religious community could produce a list of men so variously distinguished; none had extended its operations over so vast a space; yet in none had there ever been such perfect unity of feeling and action. There was no region of the globe, no walk of speculative or of active life, in which Jesuits were not to be found. They guided the counsels of kings. They deciphered Latin inscriptions. They observed the motions of Jupiter's satellites. They published whole libraries, controversy, casuistry, history, treatises on optics, Alcaic odes, editions of the fathers, madrigals, catechisms and lampoons. The liberal education of youth passed almost entirely into their hands, and was conducted by them with conspicuous ability. They appear to have discovered the precise point to which intellectual culture can be carried without risk of intellectual emancipation. Enmity itself was compelled to own that, in the art of managing and forming the tender mind, they had no equals. Meanwhile they assiduously and successfully cultivated the eloquence of the pulpit. With still greater assiduity and still greater success they applied themselves to the ministry of the confessional. Throughout Catholic Europe the secrets of every Government and of almost every family of note were in their keeping. They glided from one protestant country to another under innumerable disguises, as gay Cavaliers, as simple rustics, as Puritan preachers. They wandered to countries which neither mercantile avidity nor liberal curiosity had ever impelled any stranger to explore. They were to be found in the garb of Mandarins, superintending the Observatory at Pekin. They were to be found, spade in hand, teaching the rudiments of agriculture to the savage of Paraguay. Yet, wherever might be their residence, whatever might be their employment, their spirit was the same, entire devotion to the common cause, implicit obedience to the central authority. None of them had chosen his dwelling place or his avocation for himself. Whether the Jesuit should live under the arctic circle or under the equator, whether he should pass his life in arranging gems and collating manuscripts at the Vatican, or in persuading naked barbarians in the southern hemisphere not to eat each other, were matters which he left with profound submission to the decision of others. If he was wanted at Lima, he was on the Atlantic in the next fleet. If he was wanted at Bagdad, he was toiling through the desert with the next caravan. If his ministry was needed in some country where his life was more insecure than that of a wolf, where it was a crime to harbour him, where the heads and quarters of his brethren, fixed in the public places, showed him what he had to expect, he went without remonstrance or hesitation to his doom. Nor is this heroic spirit yet extinct. When, in our own time a new and terrible pestilence passed round the globe; when, in some great cities, fear had dissolved all the ties which hold society together; when the secular clergy had deserted their flocks; when medical succour was not to be purchased by gold; when the strongest natural affections had yielded to the love of life, even then the Jesuit was found by the pallet which bishop and curate, physician and nurse, father and mother, had deserted, bending over infected lips to catch the faint accents of confession, and holding up to the last, before the expiring penitent, the image of the expiring Redeemer.

But with the admirable energy, disinterestedness, and self-devotion which were characteristic of the society, great vices were mingled. It was alleged, and not without foundation, that the ardent public spirit which made the Jesuit regardless of his ease, of his liberty, and of his life, made him also regardless of truth and of mercy; that no means which could promote the interest of his religion seemed to him unlawful, and that by the interest of his religion he too often meant the interests of his society. It was alleged that, in the most atrocious plots recorded in history, his agency could be distinctly traced; that, constant only in attachment to the fraternity to which he belonged, he was in some countries the most dangerous enemy to freedom, and in others the most dangerous enemy of order. The mighty victories which he boasted that he had achieved in the cause of the Church were, in the judgment of many illustrious members of that Church, rather apparent than real. He had, indeed, laboured with a wonderful show of success to reduce the world under her laws, but he had done so by relaxing her laws to suit the temper of the world. Instead of toiling to elevate human nature to the noble standard fixed by divine precept and example, he had lowered the standard till it was beneath the average level of human nature. He gloried in multitudes of converts who had been baptized in the remote regions of the East; but it was reported that from some of these converts the facts on which the whole theology of the Gospel depends, had been cunningly concealed, and that others were permitted to avoid persecution by bowing down before the images of false gods, while internally repeating Paters and Aves. Nor was it only in heathen countries that such arts were said to be practised. It was not strange that people of all ranks and especially of the highest ranks, crowded to the confessionals in the Jesuit temples, for from these confessionals none went discontented away. There the priest was all things to all men. He showed just so much rigour as might not drive those who knelt at his spiritual tribunal to the Dominican or the Franciscan Church. If he had to deal with a mind truly devout, he spoke in the saintly tone of the primitive fathers; but with that very large part of mankind who have religion enough to make them uneasy when they do wrong, and not religion enough to keep them from doing wrong, he followed a very different system. Since he could not reclaim them from guilt, it was his business to save them from remorse. He had at his command an immense dispensary of anodynes for wounded consciences. In the books of casuistry which had been written by his brethren, and printed with the approbation of his superiors, were to be found doctrines consolatory to transgressors of every class. There the bankrupt was taught how he might, without sin, secrete his goods from his creditors. The servant was taught how he might, without sin, run off with his master's plate. The pander was assured that a Christian man might innocently earn his living by carrying letters and messages between married women and their gallants. The high-spirited and punctilious gentlemen of France were gratified by a decision in favour of duelling. The Italians, accustomed to darker and baser modes of vengeance, were glad to learn that they might without any crime, shoot at their enemies from behind hedges. To deceit was given a licence sufficient to destroy the whole value of human contracts and of human testimony. In truth, if society continued to hold together, if life and property enjoyed any security, it was because common sense and common humanity restrained men from doing what the society of Jesus assured them they might with a safe conscience do.

So strangely were good and evil intermixed in the character of these celebrated brethren and the intermixture was the secret of their gigantic power.—That power could never have been belonged to mere hypocrites. It could never have belonged to rigid moralists. It was to be attained only by men sincerely enthusiastic in the pursuit of a great end, and at the same time unscrupulous as to the choice of means.

From the first the Jesuits had been bound by a peculiar allegiance to the Pope. Their mission had been not less to quell all mutiny within the Church than to repel the hostility of her avowed enemies. Their doctrine was in the highest degree what has been called on our side of the Alps Ultramontane, and differed almost as much from the doctrine of Bossuet as from that of Luther. They condemned the Gallican liberties, the claim of œcumenical councils to control the Holy See, and the claim of bishops to an independent commission from heaven. Lainez, in the name of the whole fraternity, proclaimed at Trent amid the applause of the creatures of Pius the Fourth and the murmurs of French and Spanish prelates, that the Government of the faithful had been committed by Christ to the Pope alone; that in the Pope alone all sacerdotal authority was concentrated; and through the Pope alone the priests and bishops derived whatever divine authority they possessed. During many years the union between the supreme pontiffs and the order had continued unbroken. Had that union been still unbroken when James the II. ascended the English throne; had the the influence of the Jesuits, as well as the influence of the Pope been exerted in favour of a moderate and constitutional policy, it is probable that the great revolution which in a short time changed the whole state of European affairs would never have taken place. But even before the middle of the seventeenth century, the society, proud of its services and confident in its strength, had become impatient of its yoke. A generation of Jesuits sprang up who looked for protection and guidance rather to the court of France than to the court of Rome; and this disposition was not a little strengthened when Innocent the XI. was raised to the Papal throne.

The Jesuits were, at that time, engaged in a war to the death against an enemy whom they had at first disdained, but whom they had at length been forced to regard and fear. Just when their prosperity were at the heigth, they were braved by a handful of opponents, who had indeed no influence with the rulers of this world, but who were strong in religious faith and intellectual energy. There followed a long, a strange, a glorious conflict of genius against power. The Jesuit called cabinets, tribunals, universities to his aid; and they responded to the call. Port Royal appealed not in vain to the hearts and to the understandings of millions. The dictators of Christendom found themselves, on a sudden, in the position of culprits. They were arraigned on a charge of having systematically debased the standard of evangelical morality for the purpose of increasing their own influence; and the charge was enforced in a manner which at once arrested the attention of all Europe, for the chief accuser was Blaise Pascal. His intellectual powers were such as have rarely been bestowed on any of the children of men; and the vehemence of the zeal which animated him was but too well proved by the cruel penances and vigils under which his macerated frame sank into an early grave. His spirit was the spirit of St. Bernard; but the delicacy of his wit, the purity, the energy, the simplicity of his rhetoric, had never been equalled except by the great masters of Attic eloquence. All Europe read and admired, laughed and wept. The Jesuits attempted to reply, but their feeble answers were received by the public with shouts of mockery. They wanted, it is true, no talent or accomplishment into which men can be drilled by elaborate discipline; bud such discipline, though it may bring out the power of ordinary minds, has a tendency to suffocate rather than to develope original genius. It was universally acknowledged that in literary contests, the Jansenists were completely victorious. To the Jesuits nothing was left but to oppress the sect which they could not confute. Louis the XIV. was now their chief support. His conscience had, from boyhood been in their keeping; and he had learned from them to abhor Jansenism quite as much as he abhorred Protestantism, and very much more than he abhorred Atheism; Innocent the XI. on the other hand, leaned to the Jasenist opinions. The consequence was that the society found itself in a situation never contemplated by its founder. The Jesuits were estranged from the supreme pontiff and they were closely allied with a prince who proclaimed himself the champion of the Gallican liberties and the enemies of Ultramontane pretensions. Thus the order became in England an instrument of the designs of Louis, and laboured with a success which the Roman Catholics afterward long and bitterly deplored, to widen the breach between the King and the Parliament, to thwart the nuncio, to undermine the power of the lord treasurer, and to support the most desperate schemes of Tyrconnel.

LORD BYRON—THE EDINBURG REVIEW AND ITS CONTRIBUTORS, &c.

We again copy some of the lively gossip of the Ex-editor in *Jerrold's (London News:*

A REMARKABLE proof of the unprincipled character of criticism I well remember occurred in the case of Byron, and his "Hours of Idleness," published when their author was but eighteen years old, and highly creditable to those talents which were afterwards to cast confusion upon the spirit in which the *Edinburg Review* handled them. The reviewers no doubt imagined young Byron a sucking Tory, and pronounced judgment and sentence accordingly. Never was even party criticism more ungenerous or false. With a hundred others in the same work, it was clearly a party affair. This review goes down to posterity—judiciously attached to the poems in one of Murray's editions of Byron, where it will be read when the *Review* itself is no more. I quote its close thus, from that work:—"We are well off to have got so much from a man of this Lord's station, who does not live in a garret, but 'has the sway' of Newstead Abbey. Again, we say, let us be thankful, and, with *honest* Sancho, bid God bless the giver, nor look the gift horse in the mouth?" This produced Byron's "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers." That poem went through four editions. The review that caused it appeared in 1807.

I well recollect the noise made by the notice of this attack in the *Edinburg*, when the satire appeared; a proof that the public felt that party spirit governed the criticism. Some of the leading writers have since published their contributions to the *Review*, and several of them, who would have done better for their credit to have kept their vanity under, were forced to apologise for unjust criticisms, and to alter passages which, as anonymous writers, they had put forth. There are times when anonymous publication may be expedient or a matter of choice, but every one who writes anonymously, if an honourable person, can never be ashamed of what he writes. How many of their own contributions they omitted altogether, in their recent publications, the public can never know. The system was fully appreciated, and the *Quarterly Review* naturally arose in opposition to it, pursuing a similar system on the Tory side.

The *Edinburg Review* was begun in 1802, and had it supported those Liberal principles alone, under which it was established, and had it but made high feeling its guide, it would have deserved unalloyed praise. That it had high merit in relation to those times there is no doubt. Those who cannot remember the intense bigotry, the slavish feeling, the state of the judicial bench, a tool in the hands of the Crown, the Test and Corporation Acts in force, the press enslaved, illiberality, and ignorance in a hundred forms triumphant, can only imagine the utility of such a work at that precise moment. The most original, honest, and clever of the contributors was undoubtedly the Rev. Sidney Smith, the first editor, but only I believe for about a year when he came to London to reside. Mr. now Lord Jeffrey became editor, and he had for a contributor the present, now absent from his then self, Lord Brougham, who had been at first a Tory and then a Whig reviewer; and, climbing to popularity that way, and, using the last for his private end of rank and place, turned again to his early predilections. Lord Murray was another of the early contributors. The sneers in the *Edinburg* at the slave Abolitionists are said to have been the work of Brougham, who afterwards, with that happy facility of adapting his principles to the personal interests of the moment, took the opposite side of the question. Of editors, Mr. Jeffrey was confessedly the first of his day. He was not only, when he pleased, an acute, impartial, and learned critic, but he possessed that general knowledge which qualified him for examining and testing the soundness of the writings of others on a variety of topics. This long-standing work, with all its defects, did great good to Freedom, and much service to Liberal principles down to the time when Jeffrey resigned the renowned editorship. Then indeed, Liberal principles had become steady enough to make their own way. There was this difference too, between the *Edinburg* and its rival, of which we shall presently speak, that the *Edinburg* appeared with a large part of Toryism, all the fashion of the day, and all writers in place, of known fame, Church, State, and power against it. But the talent of the men I have named was powerful, and far beyond any the Tories could muster. It was doubly so with reason fighting against corruption, bad policy, and injustice. Strength and sound sense were its characteristics in the main, and to this was added the humour of Sidney Smith, purely his own, original, playful, and, when necessary, superlatively contemptuous. The *Quarterly* never exhibited anything approaching the humour of Peter Plymley, as Smith was often styled. Ever the friend of the friendless, his serious were equal to his humorous papers. Smith left no compeer. His first review was the dawning of the after man. I must give it all. A Dr. Longford had preached a very dull sermon on behalf of the Humane Society. Sidney wrote:—

"An accident which happened to the gentleman reviewing this sermon, proved, in the most striking manner, the importance of this charity by restoring to life persons in whom the vital power is suspended. He was discovered with Dr. Longford's discourse lying open before him in a state of most profound sleep, from which he could not, by any means, be awakened for a great length of time. By attending, however, to the rules prescribed by the Royal Humane Society, flinging in the smoke of tobacco, applying hot flannels, and carefully removing the discourse itself to a great distance, the critic was restored to his disconsolate brothers. The only account he could give of himself was, that he remembers reading on regularly, till he came to the following pathetic account of a drowned tradesmen; beyond which he recollects nothing."

* * * * *

I ever looked upon Sidney Smith with a feeling of respect and envy—respect for his manly support of all that was philanthropic and good, envy at his pure English style and exquisite humour.

I went one day to St Paul's to hear the Bishop of London, Dr. Beilby Porteus, of whose poem on Death I had heard much. It was a poor affair. The want of eloqnence and animation compared to Sidney Smith was striking. Venerable in years, then 75, the good bishop might have lost some of his former power... Porteus had succeeded Lowth, and I expected more, perhaps, than I had a right to do.—Smith was eloquent, earnest, and touching. Porteus's sermon was like ninety-nine out of a hundred modern sermons, every-day as to matter: flat, cold, and lifeless. I, too, was always, and still remain, fond of the French preachers. The beauty of their pulpit eloquence has not been surpassed. Saurin was an early favourite of mine. Massillon, Bourdeloue, and Bossuet, I never greatly admired.

* * * * *

We have spoken of Sir Richard Phillips, the bookseller, of Bridge-street, Blackfriars. He was a native of London, and became a bookseller at Leicester, and proprietor of the *Leicester Herald*. He was prosecuted for publishing Paine's "Rights of Man," and imprisoned for it twelve months! His house and shop were burned by accident at Leicester, and he came up to London and opened business. He was proprietor and editor of the *Monthly Magazine*. We used to lounge in his shop, and to meet there several noted men long since in the grave.—Among these was Thelwall, who was tried, with Horne Tooke, Hardy, and others, for belonging to a society of which William Pitt had been one, and of the sentiments and principles of which he had avowed his approbation.

* * * * *

England had her reign of terror under Pitt, as well as France under Robespierre. Pitt's Ministry had talked of a list of persons to be decimated, and Fox was said to have been in the list, if the court had succeeded in the monstrous convictions and bloodshed it desired of the members of the corresponding society. Pitt took away the old cap of maintenance from our copper coin, because the French had a cap of Liberty, and stuck a prong in its place. People said he substituted a dung-fork for the cap of Liberty.

* * * * *

We did not know Horne Tooke, but recollect seeing him and hearing of his dinners at Wimbledon House, which we always regarded as a classical spot from the "Diversions of Purley" and his contest with Junius. Tooke had but a small income. His visitors used to send him presents—one a pipe of wine, another venison, and so on, for the pleasure of dining with him. I remember it was said that while Burdett was his scholar the latter got all his notoriety, but returned gradually to his own miserable and mean natural character after Tooke died.

Dr. J. G. Cogswell, who is now in Europe collecting books for the Astor Library, gives, in a letter to the *Literary World* an interesting description of the magnificent private library of Lord Spencer, known as the

ALTHORP LIBRARY.

——I have already referred to the Althorp Library, and as I have recently made a visit to it, you may like to have some account of it from me, however familiar you may be with the Bibliotheca Spenceriana and Ædes Althorpianæ of Dibdin. Althorp, as you doubtless know, is one of Lord Spencer's country residences, about five miles from Northampton, and seventy-two from London, or as distances are now marked, it is three hours from the metropolis by rail, with three-quarters of an hour more for the five miles footing. The country between Northampton and Althorp is not particularly striking, but it was certainly pleasant to enjoy an old fashioned drive, sitting in an open carriage drawn by horses, with an opportunity of seeing things by the road side, and not have them flit by you like spectres; it was pleasant, too, to look upon the green fields, as green as ours in June, and see the men at work ploughing the long furrows as cheerily as if spring were back again. It was most refreshing also to breathe the fresh air of the country, after being cooped up two months in the smoky atmosphere of London. But I must on to the park; it is very spacious and grand, adorned here and there with a fine old far-stretching oak or a stately elm, varied with clumps of evergreens or smaller trees; the drive through it to the house is half a mile or more, winding amid a lawn as clean as a parlor carpet. The house has nothing imposing in its external aspect, and is in no particular style of architecture; but in passing its threshhold, one feels that he is standing on holy ground, and would almost instinctively put off his shoes from his feet. I read Dibdin in my young days, and from him learnt to regard the Spencer Library with nearly the same veneration I entertain for the Vatican, and the feeling came back upon me in its full strength, when I found myself within it. Knowing that I had allotted but one day to the inspection of the library, Mr. Appleyard the librarian, who was all courtesy and kindness, proposed to begin our work at once. The library is distributed through various rooms of the house, eight altogether I think, several of which are very large; the first in order is the room of the Incunabula, which is devoted entirely to editions of the fifteenth century, and works inseparable from them. This room is larger than a common sized parlor in New York, and is completely full. And here, indeed, are the things which the prophets and kings of literature might well desire to see, some of which can be seen in no other library in the world. What shall I select from this multitude of treasures to describe to you, for the time must fail me, were I to attempt only to name the curious and precious volumes which were successively placed before me by the learned librarian? We must begin with the block books. In specimens of this forerunner of printing, Lord Spencer is very rich; his earliest is a single leaf, on which there are two wood cuts, one representing St. Christopher carrying the infant Jesus through the sea, the other the Annunciation; beneath the cuts is an inscription, with the date 1423, which is regarded as the earliest known use of printing ink—there is clearly no falsification of any kind about it; there cannot be a doubt that it was executed at the time it was dated, and nothing of an earlier date exists, which is admitted to be genuine, that of 1418 not being so. From this onward there is a fine series of block books, besides many of the blocks with which they were stamped; nowhere can one see more perefect specimens of the early Xylographic art. One portion of the Biblia Pauperum is in curious old skin binding, on the cover of which the name of the owner is stamped, with the date of the binding, 1467—probably it would be difficult to produce a book bound earlier than this. We passed from the block books to the moveable type incunabula; of the art in this style Lord Spencer has a specimen of the earliest unquestionable date; it is a bull of Pope Nicholas V. granting plenary indulgence to all Christian arms against the Turks, who at that period were pushing on their conquests to the Mediterranean; the date is 1453. Another of the next year has evidently been altered in the date, by the insertion with a pen of an 1 to the M.CCCC.LIII. probably that the copies remaining from the preceding year might answer for 1454, and save the necessity of a new impression. Nicholas V. died in March, 1455, and was succeed by Callixtus III.; it was therefore necessary to issue a new bull. Accordingly we find that the one of the date of 1455 is in entirely different type, and the comparison of the two furnishes the best argument in favour of the priority of Gutenberg's Bible printed at Mentz (now known as the Mazarin Bible) to that of Pfister printed probably between 1456 and 1460, but without date or place, Pfister's remarkable F being found on the last dated bull. Copies of both these Bibles are in the Althorp Library, and of the first there is a copy in New York, but it cannot be seen. Next in order is the earliest Bible with a date—that of Faust and Scheffer, printed at Mentz, 1462, of which Lord Spencer has a magnificent copy on vellum, and then a suit of the early Bibles in all languages; in every case, the first edition in each language is found in this library. The earliest printed book with a date is the Psalter of 1457, of which there is a copy in fine preservation. The earliest English Bible is the one translated from the Latin and Dutch, by Miles Coverdale, and printed by him in the Low Countries in 1535, as it was not permitted to be done in England, being before Henry VIII. had decided for the Protestant faith. All the other English versions to the time of the received one, follow in proper order in the library.

In the first editions of the Greek and Latin Classics, the Library is equally rich; not one of the rare ones is wanting. I never thought much of Alduses until I saw the Althorp set in vellum, and now I know how beautiful they are. Until the addition of the Cassano Library to this collection, Lord Spencer had no copies of the very rare Naples Horace and Juvenal; finding them in the possession of the Duke of Cassano, he offered him six hundred pounds sterling for these two small volumes, which offer the Duke declined, unless Lord Spencer would extend his purchase to the whole library; it was in this way that the Cassano Library happened to be bought by him. Don't fret, I've little more to add. You remember Dibdin's glowing account in his Bibliomania of the Valdarfar Boccaccio, for which the Duke of Marlborough, when Marquis of Blanford, paid, or rather agreed to pay, £2260. Dibdin's account of it used to form one of my stock stories, and now I can add that I have had the precious volume in hand; it is in the Althorp Library, having been purchased by the late Lord Spencer for about £900, when it was sold under a decree to satisfy the claims of the Duke of Roxburgh's heirs, to whom it had belonged, when bought by the Marquis of Blandford. The whole history of this volume, from the time of its being discovered in the Library of the Monastery, until it came into Lord Spencer's hands, is most curious; it has now found a proper resting place, and reposes quietly among its fit associates.

I cannot quit the subject of the Althorp Library, without observing, that everything there is in proper keeping, every copy is a choice one, all books of prints are proofs before the letters, the binding of every volume is of the best and richest kind, and they are kept as neatly and as free from dust as fresh books. The number is not very great, 56,000 volumes only, but that is enough to include everything worth having. As to the paintings and other works of art, which form the embellishments of the Ædes Althorpianæ, they are just such as one would desire to see in such a princely residence; but I have already trespassed too long on your patience to enter upon an account of them now. Never have I spent a more aggreeable or a more interesting day than that of my visit to Althorp, and nowhere have I met a kinder and more corteous reception.

PROFITABLE TRADE IN RIDDLES.

FROM THE GERMAN, BY MRS. ST. SIMON.

Nine persons sailed from Basle, down the Rhine. A Jew who wished to go to Schlampi was allowed to come on board, and journey with them, upon condition that he would conduct himself with propriety, and give the captain eighteen kreutzers for his passage.

Now, it is true something jingled in the Jew's pocket when he struck his hand against it; but the only money there was therein, was a twelve kreutzer piece, for the other was a brass button. Notwithstanding this, he accepted the offer with gratitude. For he thought of himself—"Something may be earned, even upon the water." There is many a man who has grown rich upon the Rhine.

During the first part of the voyage the passengers were very talkative and merry, and the Jew, with his wallet under his arm, for he did not lay it aside, was the object of much mirth and mockery, as, alas, is often the case with those of his nation. But as the vessel sailed onward, and passed Thuringen and St. Veit, the passengers one after the other grew silent, and gasped, and gazed, listlessly down the river until one cried—

"Come, Jew! Do you know any pastime that will amuse us? Your fathers must have contrived many a one during their long journey in the wilderness."

Now is the time, thought the Jew, to shear my sheep! And he proposed that they should sit round in a circle, and propound various curious questions to each other, and he with their permission would sit with them. Those who could not answer the questions, should pay the one who propounded them a twelve kreutzer piece, and those who answered them pertinently, should receive a twelve kreutzer piece.

This proposal pleased the company; and hoping to divert themselves with the Jew's wit or stupidity, each one asked, at random, whatever chanced to enter his head.

Thus, for example, the first asked—"How many soft boiled eggs could the giant Goliath eat upon an empty stomach?"

All said that it was impossible to answer that question, and each of them paid his twelve kreutzers.

But the Jew said—"One; for he who has eaten one egg, cannot eat a second one upon an empty stomach," and the other paid him twelve kreutzers.

The second thought—"Wait, Jew, I will try you out of the New Testament, and I think I shall win my piece! Why did the Apostle Paul write the second epistle to the Corinthians?"

The Jew said—"Because he was not in Corinth, otherwise he would have spoken to them." So he won another twelve kreutzer piece.

When the third saw that the Jew was so well versed in the Bible, he tried him in a different way,—"Who prolongs his work to as great a length as possible, and still completes it in time?"

"The ropemaker, if he is industrious," replied the Jew.

In the mean time they drew near to a village, and one said to the other—"That is Bamlach." Then the fourth asked—"In what month do the people of Bamlach eat the least?"

The Jew said—"In February, for it has only twenty-eight days."

The fifth said—"There are two natural brothers, and still, only one of them is my uncle."

The Jew said—"Your uncle is your father's brother, and your father is not your uncle."

A fish now leaped out of the water, and the sixth asked, "What fish have their eyes nearest together?"

The Jew said—"The smallest."

The seventh asked—"How can a man ride from Basle to Berne, in the shade in the summer time, when the sun shines?"

The Jew said—"When he comes to a place where there is no shade, he must dismount and go on foot."

The eighth asked—"When a man rides in the winter time from Berne to Basle, and has forgotten his gloves, how must he manage so that his hands shall not freeze?"

The Jew said—"He must make fists out of them."

The ninth was the last. This one asked—"How can five persons divide five eggs, so that each man shall receive one, and still one remain in the dish?"

The Jew said—"The last must take the dish with the egg, and he can let it lie there as long as he pleases."

But now it came to his turn, and he determined to make a good sweep. After many preliminary compliments, he asked with an air of mischievous friendliness—"How can a man fry two trouts in three pans so that a trout may lie in each pan?"

No one could answer this, and one after the other gave him a twelve kreutzer piece.

But when the ninth desired that he should solve the riddle, he rocked to and fro, shrugged his shoulders, and rolled his eyes—"I'm a poor Jew," he said at last.

The rest cried—"What has that to do with it? Give us the answer."

"You must not take it amiss, for I am a poor Jew." At last, after much persuasion and many promises that they would do him no harm, he thrust his hand into his pocket, took out one of the twelve kreutzer pieces that he had won, laid it upon the table and said—"I do not know the answer any more than you. Here are my twelve kreutzers."

When the others heard these words, they opened their eyes, and said that this was hardly according to agreement. But as they could not control their laughter, and were wealthy and good natured men, and as the Jew had helped them to while away the time from St. Veit to Schlampi, they let it pass, and the Jew took with him from the vessel—let a good arithmetician reckon up for me how much the Jew carried home with him. He had a twelve kreutzer piece and a brass button when he came on board. He won nine twelve kreutzer pieces by his answers, nine with his own riddle, one he paid back and eighteen kreutzers he gave to the captain.—*New York Organ.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

"How MONKEYS do resemble men!" exclaims *Jerrold's News*. "The *Doncaster Gazette* tells of a chimpanzee, recently given to Lord Fitzwilliam and kept at Wentworth, which is very fond of wine."

MEMOIR OF FENELON DISCOVERED.—*La Démocratie Pacifique* says that a memoir of Fénélon, in his own handwriting, has been discovered among some old papers in the Douai Museum, by the librarian, M. Duthillœul; it is now in the press.

"WITH THE old SAXONS," says Dr. KNOX (*Medical Times,*) "land could not become the especial property of any individual; it belonged to the people. Property in land was introduced by the Roman and Norman laws, and adopted clumsily by the Saxons; 'whatever they adopted they did it clumsily,' is the expression of Sir F. Palgrave."

A RAILWAY BALLOON.—One J. Browne, Esq. advertises a "Balloon Railway," to take folks to California! The "Balloon Railway," says Browne, "would not cost one-fiftieth part of the expense of the steam rails." It also has "the means of landing passengers safe." Very good, Browne; but are the passengers required to bring their *own* strait-waistcoats, or are they provided with them?—*Punch.*

LADY FRANKLIN.—THE ARCTIC EXPEDITION.—We understand that this most estimable lady, with all the fervour of a devoted wife, is at present engaged in a pious pilgrimage to the ports whence the whale-ships are likely to proceed to Davis's Straits, with a view to plead her anxieties and distresses, and to animate the daring and generous commanders of these ships in her cause.—*Morning Herald.*

THE TIDES IN THE GERMAN OCEAN.—A striking example occurs to us of the happy connexion of theory with observation, in the prediction that there must exist a spot in the German Ocean—the central point of an area of rotation, produced by the meeting and mutual action of two opposite tides—where no rise or fall of tide whatever could occur; a prediction actually verified by Captain Hewett in 1839, without any prior knowledge that such a point had been supposed to exist. This is one among the many triumphs of like kind achieved by modern science.—*Quarterly Review.*

SPELLING REFORM IN FRANCE.—The Paris correspondent of the *Phonetic News* writes: "You lament the ignorance that prevails in the agricultural districts of England; but the French peasant grovels in a still worse state of mental darkness and superstition. It is rare to find a working man, at a distance from the larger towns, who is able to read. Here, as with you, the wretched orthography of the language is an almost insuperable barrier to instruction for those occupied in field labour. It must be acknowledged, however, that the French orthography is a shade less absurd than the English, as the same combinations with few exceptions, have always the same sounds; but the number of useless letters is greater than in English."

CURIOUS ERRATUM.—The editor of a country paper, speaking of the people of France, says, in a beautiful fulminating leader: "When the Provisional Government promised the labouring classes that they should never again want either work or high wages, *them asses* actually believed it." We though this rather strong, and a little ungrammatical; when the next week's paper contained the following: "Erratum.—For 'them asses' in our last, read 'the masses.'" However, there is a deal of coarse truth wrapped up in a bit of bad grammar sometimes. For ourselves, we decidedly prefer "*them asses.*"—*Punch.*

LABOURERS' CITIES.—A new French journal, *Le Peuple*, gives some account of a philanthropic scheme conceived and about to be executed, by M. Chabert in the interest of the labouring classes—which extends in some useful respects the principle of the English model lodging-house. His project is to erect in each of the arro ndissments of Paris what he calls "Labourers' Cities." Clean and airy lodgings are to be provided for the tenants, at a price below that of their present tainted abodes; consisting of a kitchen, bed-chamber, and sitting-room, heated by stoves in winter which are to be ventilators in summer. A common washhouse will be established for "each city"—and bathing-houses, the tickets for which will be so distributed among the tenants as to allow a certain number of baths per month to each inhabitant.—*Athenæum.*

DR. K